UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. IX WINTER, 1957 No. 4

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Truth and Charity - the Octave for 1958

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

Personalities of the Council of Florence - Pope Eugenius IV

DE SALES STANDERWICK, S. A.

Reform Judaism in the United States

JAMES KRITZECK, PH. D.

The Conference at Tioumliline

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Letter of Pope Pius XII Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Unity Octave — The Church of England and the Question of Divorce - a Comment by Fr. Francis Clark, S. J. — *Protestantism in Pennsylvania - a Paper Delivered at the World Congress of the Laity by* Fr. Joseph Kerns, S. J. — *Judaism Seeking Itself - a Report on the Ideological Conference at Jerusalem by* Edward Vogt.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS - INDEX FOR 1957

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S. J., Professor of Patristic Theology, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome, and Rector of the College of St. Robert Bellarmine.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association,* and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:

Rev. Fr. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary;

Rev. Fr. GERMANUS TOMAINO, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for Italy - 900 Lire (Seminarians 700 Lire)
Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscriptions $ 2.00
Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand
London. W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. IX WINTER, 1957 No. 4

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Truth and Charity - the Octave for 1958

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

Personalities of the Council of Florence - Pope Eugenius IV

DE SALES STANDERWICK, S. A.

Reform Judaism in the United States

JAMES KRITZECK, PH. D.

The Conference at Tioumliline

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Letter of Pope Pius XII Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Unity Octave — The Church of England and the Question of Divorce - a Comment by Fr. Francis Clark, S. J. — *Protestantism in Pennsylvania - a Paper Delivered at the World Congress of the Laity by* Fr. Joseph Kerns, S. J. — *Judaism Seeking Itself - a Report on the Ideological Conference at Jerusalem by* Edward Vogt.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS - INDEX FOR 1957

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

† Aloysius Traglia
Archiep. Caesarien. Vicesgerens

Rome, 13 February 1958.

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

TRUTH AND CHARITY

The Unity Octave for 1958

Once again divided Christians will be praying God for unity. They will be of one mind with the prayer of Christ, that they may all be one.

That is enough to sustain their hopes, and doubtless even to achieve a genuine progress towards unity. It is therefore an auspicious week for which to prepare, and everything must be done to make it fervent, popular, and fraternal.

No doubt, we shall continue to observe it for a long time yet, for the divisions which it is trying to overcome are both long-standing and deep. Today we cannot even offer the same prayers in praying for unity. Whatever forms we may use, our intentions differ. Catholics wholeheartedly believe that the unity willed by Christ is that which they already possess under the authority of the Vicar of Christ, into which all the faithful of other confessions are invited to come. When they pray for unity, they pray of necessity that those who are not Catholics may become so. But non-Catholics cannot offer a similar prayer: if they should offer it, unity would not be a matter of restoration, it would be accomplished. But alas! that is far from being the case. We admit this with sadness, but not with despair or impatience.

It is not for us to make terms with Providence, but it is our duty to follow the movement of the Holy Spirit which has led Christian souls in our time to desire and to demand unity. The more obedient we are, the more we will devote to this great cause the efforts it deserves, and the more we will hasten the day of its achievement. If the time seems long to us, we must labour the more, and thus we can shorten it. After so many centuries of separation and controversy, and, it must be admitted, of wrongs on both sides, the unity of Christians in the one faith cannot be realised without a veritable miracle of divine grace. The difficulty would be already great even if it were only a question of charity, for that would be strong enough to overcome nationalist attachments, material interests, and habits and affections which have be-

come second nature. But it is also a matter of truth; that is what makes the problem of unity so difficult.

Progress is undeniable in the field of charity. Contacts are multiplied in one communion after another, the tone of discussion is becoming more and more courteous, agreements on common interests are established, and true friendships are made. Certainly all this can progress still further in warmth and in trustful confidence. But an environment has already been established in which the objective study of the problems is made possible, and where it has shown itself fruitful.

The fundamental obstacle lies in the conflict of doctrines. Our separated brethren in the East maintain, among other less important differences, that Papal supremacy is something unfounded. As for the West, one must remember that the Lutheran revolt, if it was favoured by external and transitory circumstances, was above all a novel method of understanding the Gospel. If Luther was led in so short a time to clamour against the Pope, the Bishops, the Mass, monastic vows, most of the Sacraments, and the value and necessity of good works, it is because in the solitude of his cell he was persuaded that faith in God's forgiveness is the necessary and sufficient condition for salvation. As long as Christians cling to these legacies of Constantinople or Wittenburg, divisions remain, with their significant effects. What is more, they are propagated and spread in new lands or in Catholic countries to separate those whom Christ willed to be one.

Those who belong to a non-Catholic communion, if they become missionaries or even if they support their missions, are thwarting and often fighting the Catholic apostolate. And they are creating a situation which not only extends the misfortune of disunity but also arouses feelings of irritation and depression which emperil the progress achieved in the field of charity. Protestant proselytism in South America, Spain, and Italy has created a painful atmosphere. The legitimate Catholic reaction which can scarcely be lacking has provoked the recriminations in turn of the Protestant press and the World Council. There is now under consideration a plan of integrating the promotion machinery of Protestant missions (the International Missionary Council) into the World Council; and when this is done that Council will be placing its influence and resources at the service of Protestant missions. If it does not halt at the edge of the slope, it will become an anti-Roman block, and although established to promote unity it will in fact have strengthened and exacerbated the division.

One must see things as they are. Let us sincerely love our separated brethren, and show them in every way that we love them.

That is essential, but it is not all that is needed. If one wishes to progress towards unity we must at the same time seek for unity in the truth. No drawing together is lasting if it leaves divided intellects. Let us hope that those who direct the World Council realise this. One sees in the Re-union Report of the Central Committee of this Council at New Haven last August that it was asked if the Council had not weakened in its interest in unity; to be sure, a negative reply was given, but in a manner which did not suggest any increasing concern for unity in doctrine. (See in this Report, p. 10, the intervention of Prof. d'Espine, and on p. 81, the Report of the General Secretary).

The particular organization for theological research, *Faith and Order,* which was at first an independent movement and later a comparatively autonomous commission in the Council, is now only one section in one of five departments of the Council. It is in *Faith and Order,* however, that the brightest hopes of unity in that which concerns the World Council are to be found.

It must be remembered that the Council, by its very nature, in spite of the best intentions and putting things in their most favourable light, can only move slowly towards its goal. But circling around it are freer activities. Discussions continue to be held in which the burning solicitude for truth is united with the sincerest charity.

May our prayers during this Octave which opens with the Feast of the Chair of Peter at Rome and closes with that of the Conversion of St. Paul win every abundance of grace and illumination, and especially may it be given to our theologians to present the title-deeds of the Catholic Church with all the brilliance of their divine authority to the separated Christians of both East and West.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

I. Pope Eugenius IV

The name 'Council of Florence' is really a kind of abbreviation because Florence was only one of the places where the Council met. To implement the decree *Frequens* of the Council of Constance (1), Martin V, a few months before he died in 1431, had summoned a Council to meet in Basle. Eugenius IV, his successor, after long controversies with the Basler, transferred that Council to Ferrara (Dec. 1437). From Ferrara it went to Florence (Jan. 1439), and from Florence to Rome (Sept. 1443) where it came to end. The name 'Florence' is, however, attached to it in preference to the others, not only because it is generally looked on as different from the Council of Basle, but mainly because it was in that city that there was accomplished the primary object of the transferred Council, the union of the Greeks with the Latins (6 July 1439).

The person most responsible for the success of the Council was the Pope, Eugenius IV. Gabriele Condulmaro, born in Venice about the year 1383 of a rich family, while still young gave all his heritage to the poor to enter the newly-founded monastery of S. Giorgio in Alga. There he lived an exact and laborious life. In 1407 he was made Bishop of Siena by his uncle Gregory XII and the next year he was created cardinal. He took part in the Council of Constance after the abdication of Gregory and assisted at the election of Martin V (Nov. 1417), by whom later he was entrusted with various offices such as the government of the March of Ancona and of Bologna. On Martin's death, Cardinal Condulmaro was immediately elected pope (3 March 1431) and crowned eight days later.

Martin had bequeathed to his successor a double task, the conduct of the newly-summoned Council of Basle and the union of the Greeks. Martin himself, throughout all the years of his reign, had been in regular contact with Constantinople working for union, and shortly before his death had almost concluded an agreement with the Greek Emperor, John VIII, and the Greek Church for a

---

(1) The decree *Frequens* established that the next Council should be held after 5 years, then after another 7 years, then every 10 years.

common council to be held in Italy at papal expense. He had, too, left to his successor a problem, in that he had put too much Church property into the hands of members of his family, the Colonnas, and they were disinclined to give it up, which involved Eugenius in war with them in and about Rome in the early months of his reign.

The Council of Basle was another problem. It opened with so few members and in such adverse circumstances that Eugenius thought he could dispose of it by transferring it to Bologna to meet again after an interval of eighteen months. But it would not be disposed of. The anarchy in the Church during the Great Schism (2) and the consequent complete lack of discipline and the state of moral decadence had produced a reaction in the shape of the Conciliar Movement and the demand for ecclesiastical reform. The Conciliar Movement sprang from the widespread conviction that a General Council representing the whole Church had its authority directly from God and was superior to a pope at least in respect of faith, heresy, and reform. As it seemed that the rival popes and antipopes could not or would not settle or sacrifice their claims, to give the Church a single, stable government, good men looked to a Council to impose peace and with peace the much needed reform. But, while all were agreed that reform was both necessary and urgent, all were equally of the view that it should begin with someone else, not with themselves. The Fathers met in Basle were ardent reformers, who also believed that the principle of the superiority of a Council over a pope had been defined in Constance, so with their few but rapidly growing numbers they refused to obey the papal dissolution and instead summoned the Pope to give an account of himself to them. Tension between Council and Pope grew. Eugenius, barely finished with the reduction of the Colonnas, was attacked by the troops of Milan (always hostile to him, as it was also at this time to Florence and Venice) and of Naples (where Alfonso of Aragon was trying to wrest the crown from René of Anjou, the papal nominee), which, when later the harassed citizens of Rome revolted, would lead him to flee down the Tiber in disguise to Florence (4 June 1434). Meanwhile fifteen out of twenty-one cardinals and many other lesser clergy had thrown in their lot with the Council. So at the end of 1433 Eugenius withdrew his Bull of dissolution and gave a guarded approbation to the Council of Basle.

As early as September 1431 the Council had urged Eugenius

---

(2) From 1378 till 1417 there was not a time when, besides the true pope, there was not one or even two antipopes.

to make contact with Costantinople and invite Greeks to Basle. Then, by-passing the Pope, the Fathers themselves sent two messengers to John VIII, who in July 1434 returned with three Greek envoys, one of whom was Isidore, later Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia. These, on the basis of the pact discussed with Martin V, agreed with the Council for the Greeks to come to the west to a place to be chosen from certain specific cities (not including Basle) at the expense of the Council. The agreement was put into the form of the decree, *Sicut pia Mater,* which was solemnly ratified by the Council on 7 September 1434 and sworn to by the Greeks.

Eugenius, however, left in ignorance of these negotiations, had in the interval despatched Cristoforo Garatoni to Constantinople and through him arranged with the Emperor for a council to be held in that city. But, when he heard of the decree *Sicut pia Mater,* he sent Garatoni and two messengers of the Emperor newly arrived in Italy to the Council, and as the Fathers were set on retaining their own pact, he sacrificed his plan and acquiesced in theirs, though with misgivings. Thereupon the Council sent three new envoys to the Byzantine court to implement the decree and also (though without success) to persuade the Greeks to accept Basle as the seat of the future Council.

The more Eugenius conceded, the more the Council demanded. In the name of reform, it forbade the payment of annates ([3]) to the Pope, though it exacted them for itself. It set up all the machinery of Church government, exactly parallel to the papal Curia. It appointed 'legates *a latere*': it even decreed, in the name of the Council, a plenary indulgence. Its grim determination to reduce the papacy to a position of unimportant inferiority alienated many of its own supporters, and cardinals, clerics, and theologians began to rally to the papal cause. The climax came in an open split within the Council over the choice of the city for the meeting with the Greeks. In spite of its own convention *Sicut pia mater,* the section of the Council more hostile to the papacy (and afraid to hazard its pretensions to superiority by moving into Italy) chose and decreed Avignon, though it was not one of the cities mentioned in the agreement and was totally unacceptable to the Greeks. The more moderate section simultaneously (7 Mar. 1437) decreed Udine, Florence, or some other suitable Italian town. The latter decree was taken to the Pope who, with the approval of all the Greek envoys, accepted it as conciliar and wasted no time in putting it into execution. A papal fleet sailed for Costantinople arriving on

---

([3]) Annates were a year's revenue payable to the Roman Curia by all new bishops and beneficiaries.

3 September. The Council's fleet put in a month later. The Greeks chose to come to Italy in the papal ships and set off on 27 November 1437.

By Bulls dated 18 September and 30 December, Eugenius transferred the Council of Basle to Ferrara, where in fact the new Council opened on 8 January, the Pope arriving two weeks later. The Greeks reached Venice on 8 February and Ferrara on 4 and 7 March, the Emperor John VIII with his brother and royal suite, the Patriarch Joseph II with twenty Greek metropolitans, representatives of Moldavia and Georgia, and a numerous gathering of clerics and monks — in all about 700 persons. Isidore of Kiev with the Bishop of Susdal and a few other clerical and lay envoys reached the Council in the mid-August following.

One of the motives that had moved the Greeks to accept a council in the west was the dire need of their country. If Constantinople was not to fall to Turkish arms, there had to be some form of crusade to rally the western princes to its aid. A crusade could be set on foot only by the Pope, and he would be more enthusiastic in the cause if the Churches were united. There was, too, a real desire for Church union for its own sake, because all Christians, whether eastern or western, regarded the division of the Churches as a tragedy. But the difficulties in the way of union were not small. The Oriental Church believed that the schism stemmed from Latin arbitrary action in adding to the Creed and indeed from Latin heterodoxy. The Latins looked on the Eastern Church as a ' daughter-Church ', to be ' brought back ' to the bosom of the mother-Church which it had left and whose faith it should in all points embrace. This difference of principle soon showed itself. The Patriarch refused to follow the western custom of saluting the Pope, as head of the Church, by kissing his foot, and a little later the Emperor objected to the proposal that in the public sessions the papal throne, and it alone, should be central and as it were uniting the Churches, which would have symbolised superiority to both. Eugenius, so as not to wreck the Council at the start on points of etiquette, yielded so far as to accept a compromise.

The Council of union opened with a solemn session on 9 April 1438. Then, to satisfy the Emperor who wanted that there be time for the western princes to send their envoys, nothing was done for months, during which, of course, the Greeks (and not a few Latins) were living at papal expense, and the papal exchequer was growing emptier and emptier. Inevitably the Pope's subventions to his visitors fell into arrears, and they began to feel the pinch of poverty. In June and July, to pacify the impatient Latins, there were some

discussion about Purgatory, but only between committees of ten. Soon plague fell on the city of Ferrara, but the Pope and the Greek ecclesiastics did not leave it. Finally, on 8 October dogmatic discussions were started on the subject chosen by the Greeks — the legitimacy of the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed.

Again there was some little friction. Mark, Metropolitan of Ephesus, wanted to expose his whole case before the Latins answered, and as part of it, to read all the decrees of all the Councils that touched on the immutability of the Creed, which the Latins thought quite unnecessary. Eugenius refused to insist that it was for the Latin Church to say what and how things should be done (as many of his advisers urged him to do), and let the Metropolitan of Ephesus have his way. The sessions in Ferrara went on till mid-December. Eugenius missed none of them, though he would have had abundant excuse if he had. He was still, of course, directing the ordinary business of the Church; he was all the time being harassed by his enemies who possessed themselves in these very months of cities dangerously close to Ferrara; the Council of Basle had again refused to be translated and a remnant, now more viciously hostile than ever, lingered on to subvert the loyalty particularly of France and Germany to the Holy See (4) and in November 1439 to elect the last antipope in history; and the Council was lasting far longer that had been anticipated and was living largely on borrowed money.

Florence was Eugenius's chief creditor. It was also firmly opposed to Milan and at a safe distance from the activities of Milan's Condottiere Piccinino. Eugenius therefore persuaded the Emperor to continue the discussion in that city and thither the whole Council moved in January 1439. Though the debates in Ferrara on the legitimacy of the addition to the Creed had been inconclusive, now to satisfy the Latins the subject of discussion would be the doctrine of the *Filioque,* whether, that is, the Latin dogma that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son was or was not sound.

There were eight public sessions in Florence ending on 24 March, which left the question still unsettled. Then began a period of private meetings, of discussions between committees, of comings and goings of messengers, of mutual dissatisfaction. The Pope was bitterly disappointed that so much time, talk and expense had produced no result and he expressed his feelings to the Greeks on 27 May. That speech proved to be a stimulus. Those among the

---

(4) Both these countries adopted a policy of neutrality to both Pope and Basle: England throughout was steadily and consistently loyal to Eugenius.

Orientals who had been convinced by the Latin arguments of Latin orthodoxy (and they were all the intellectuals among the Greek clerics save one) redoubled their efforts to persuade their fellows and appealing to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, they succeeded. In this way the chief difference between the Churches was solved. Other questions were still unsettled, but there were more difficulties and misunderstandings. Finally, agreement was reached also on them, the Pope yielding to Greek and imperial insistence on a number of smaller points.

The decree was written, signed and, on 6 July 1439, publicly proclaimed in solemn session.

But the Council was not yet finished for Eugenius IV. There was the 'Council' of Basle to be dealt with, for it had dared to declare « Gabriele Condulmaro » deposed (25 June 1439), and there were other Orientals besides the Greeks. On 4 September in solemn session the Pope renewed all the penalties formerly decreed against the Basler unless they repented, and not long afterwards he had the supject of papal versus conciliar authority (the basis of disagreement between him and Basle) thoroughly discussed in the Council. At this same time delegates of Armenians from the Black Sea area were in Rome for union and the 'Decree for the Armenians' was promulgated by common consent on 22 November 1439. Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia, left Venice on 22 December as papal legate to make union effective in Poland-Lithuania and the Russian princedoms. Papal agents were already on their way to invite the Copts of Egypt and of Abyssinia to union: the former sent delegates who agreed to the 'Decree for the Copts', promulgated on 4 February 1442. In Rome, whither the Council had moved in September 1443, union with the Syrians of Mesopotamia was celebrated on 30 September 1444 and with certain Chaldeans of Cyprus on 7 August 1445.

Eugenius had promised material aid to the Greeks to help them defend their imperial city. However, though he could cover part of the expenses, he could not supply troops. For that he depended on the temporal princes, and, to rally them to the cause, he launched a crusade and sent his ambassadors to the princely courts to win support. Unfortunately most of the princes were too intent on their own affairs. England and France were just emerging from the Hundred Years' War. The German Electors were testing strength against the German Emperor and, most unfortunate of all, Austria and Hungary were divided on a question of succession to the Hungarian crown, which involved, too, Ladislas King of Poland. Exhortation and embassies proved unavailing till Elizabeth of Hungary died (1442). Then, with Ladislas ruling over Poland-

Lithuania and Hungary, the crusade was set afoot, the Pope furnishing money and a fleet, the King supplying the land troops. But Eugenius's hopes were sadly disappointed, for after some preliminary successes the Christian army was defeated at Varna (10 November 1444), King Ladislas and Cardinal Cesarini, the papal legate, both being killed. There was no chance of another crusade on the same scale being put in the field in Eugenius's lifetime; all the same he still continued to encourage and support opposition to the Turk wheresoever it was manifested.

The issue of the battle of Varna meant, of course, that Eugenius's great effort to save Constantinople from the Turk had failed. It had other consequences too, in that it weakened the appeal of union among the Greeks and strengthened the opposition to it. Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus, who enjoyed a reputation both for holiness of life and for learning, had never, even in Italy, concurred in the union. On his return to Constantinople he conducted a campaign of unremitting and clever propaganda against it, which, as it was so completely in harmony with traditional Greek hostility to the Latins, effectively won popular support against it. The majority of the prelates, who in Florence had let their heads lead their hearts, now in face of the general attitude obeyed their own inner feeling and prejudices, and once more let their hearts lead their heads. John VIII, though personally loyal to the union, did not impose it. Unionist patriarchs, successors of Joseph II who had died in Florence (10 June 1439), could not do much against imperial inactivity and popular opposition. During Eugenius's lifetime the union was never proclaimed in Constantinople.

The Council of union with the Orientals did more to unite the Latin Church within itself than it did to unite it with the Greek Church. The remnant at Basle with its antipope Felix V still existed (it survived Eugenius by two years), but it was receiving less and less support. France, though it did not abrogate its Pragmatic Sanction, drew nearer to Eugenius. Scotland formally acknowledged his 'obedience' on 4 November 1443. At about the same time Frederick III of Austria definitively rejected Basle in favour of the Pope. The German Electors, too, were moving in the same direction when Eugenius nearly alienated all of them by excommunicating two of them for their continued support of Basle. The crisis was passed, but only just in time. Eugenius was literally on his death-bed when their representatives read to him the instruments of their adhesion, and so he died (23 February 1447) with the Latin Church at least united around him.

Eugenius was a simple-minded man, of the type who sees one line of duty clearly and is prepared to do that duty at all costs. His duty cost him dear — flight from Rome, constant military assaults, the bitter persecution from Basle, the desertion of 'friends' when his fortunes were low, the opposition of not a few good men like Cardinal Cesarini, the disloyalty of France and Germany, the lack of financial resource and dependence on others — all of which he bore with endurance and courage.

His very simplicity had its defects. If he had given or withdrawn his trust, he was difficult to change, and so at times too loyal to unworthy friends and too hard on those he considered enemies. But he did forgive many such, like Cesarini who from having been the spokesman of the opposition of Basle became a leading figure of the Council of Florence. If he gave his word, he kept it as far as that was possible. At any time from 1431 to 1442, by abandoning his support of René of Anjou, he could have bought off the opposition of Alfonso of Aragon whose representatives at Basle were among the bitterest and the most redoubtable of his opponents and whose constant warfare was a source of great expense and anxiety, but not till Alfonso had actually captured Naples and René had fled from Italy obviously never to return did he make terms.

He was, too, conciliatory. Having withdrawn his Bull of dissolution of the Council of Basle, he tried to get along with the Fathers: he was ready to accept their *Sicut pia mater* instead of his own plan; he would have endured the loss of the annates if some compensation had been made (for even a Pope and a Curia need money if they are to direct a Church); when the Council was set on granting an indulgence, Eugenius offered either to provide the money himself or to proclaim the indulgence in his own name 'with the approval of the Council' — further he could not go in concessions — but the Council did not accept his offer. Similarly with the Greeks, without letting his action compromise the principles he believed in, he yielded on many points of detail where insistence might have prejudiced the attainment of the larger issues.

Eugenius has been blamed because, when the Church so badly needed reform, his Council of Florence did nothing to effect it. It is, however, an open question whether any Council could at that time have produced a general reform of the Church, because no one section of the Church, Curia, episcopacy, Christian princes, or laity, was willing to be reformed. Eugenius did a great deal to further reform where it was certainly possible. He seconded every

effort of the many then being made to build up the reforming elements, the 'Observants', in the great religious Orders, Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines, Camaldolese, and others. As a result, monasteries and convents all over Italy, in France, Germany, Poland, Spain and as far aways as Caffa in the Crimea and Jerusalem, were brought to a higher level of religious life and became the nucleus of a growing religious revival, for the great missionary preachers of that age came from them. If Eugenius did not (and could not) reform the whole Church directly, he did much to reform it indirectly, beginning with what was most feasible and what would have most influence on the rest.

His heart was in that reform, because he himself had been a monk of a reformed monastery, and he retained throughout his life the spirit and, to a larger extent, the habits of his early dedication of himself. He always had with him four chaplains, two of them monks of his old monastery of S. Giorgio, two monks of S. Giustina, a monastery that was the centre and inspiration of much monastic reform. With them he recited the breviary daily, using the copy that he had himself written out in his early years of religious life. He was very abstemious in food, taking only one meal a day and that mainly of fruit and vegetables, and never drinking wine. In his charities to the poor (and access to him of all in need was easy) he was most open-handed, so much so that he was an embarassment to his secretaries who often found themselves in difficulties to find money to meet current needs. He rarely appeared in public, so reports a contemporary Florentine, but when he did, on such occasions, for example, as Easter to give the Easter blessing, such was the impression he made that « it not only seemed that those people beheld the vicar of Christ on earth, but His divinity ... Of a truth, at that time he seemed to be what he represented ».

The one duty that Eugenius had set himself was not to sacrifice any right of the Church whether to the soaring ambitious of Basle or to exigencies of political life. His chief claim to fame in the Church is perhaps not so much his ardour for Church union as his courage, his indomitable courage, in withstanding the Conciliarists and safeguarding the traditional constitution of the Church.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

REFORM JUDAISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Since 1945, among the five million Jews living in the United States, there has taken place a kind of revival of Judaism that merits our attention. As the people once chosen by God to be the recipients of His Revelation, the custodians of His Law, and the true worshippers of the One True God, the Jews have come down through history, alone, persecuted, suffering, and opposed. Their holy religion, mainly centered in practices and observances commanded by the Torah and the Talmud, was sorrowfully stricken by two plagues, the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, and the wide and constant growth of the Diaspora away from Palestine, the land given to them by God.

In the United States, in the 1920's and 1930's, « Jewishness » as a way of life — that is, all Jewish activities without the auspices of religion — failed when young Jewish men and women who attended rationalistic, liberal colleges lost their faith in Judaism; later, they married, raised children, and began to make their way forward in modern American life. As they approached middle age and mature thoughtfulness, they came to realize that they could not answer for themselves or for their children the question, « Why am I a Jew? ». The only place they could turn for an adequate solution was their religion, their synagogue, their rabbi. But, this step once taken, they discovered that they had a choice — Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism lay before them. Many chose the Reform, for since 1945 Reform synagogues have grown from two hundred to five hundred in number, and there are now about seven hundred Reform rabbis.

Rather strangely, we would look today in vain for Reform Judaism in Europe, where it originally began a century and a half ago. The story can be told briefly. Innocently enough, Moses Mendelssohn, a religious philosopher, started it when he translated parts of the Bible into German. Two rabbis, Leopold Zunz and Abraham Geiger, furthered the modernist tendencies that had already begun with the laity when, freed from their ghettos, they moved out among a secular, critical, and cultural society, mastered German, absorbed the culture around them, and were led to ques-

tion the authority of the rabbis, to adapt new modes of thinking to their stabilized way of life, and to review scientifically the many outgrowths that had been developed around the Law in the course of long centuries.

The progressive ideas of Schelling and especially Hegel were in the air, calling thinking men to a mode of Biblical criticism and historical investigation that seemed at the time so fascinating and so reasonable but which the passage of years proved to be often destructive and devastating to the religious heart of mankind. Thus these new ideas in Judaism tried to adapt the ancient and sacred faith to the surroundings and environment of the day. The Reform received violent opposition in Germany, so much so that these liberal trends came to a definite halt with the Breslau Conference in 1846. Brief and short-lived attempts at Reform were made in Hungary and Russia but without success.

The Reform spread at the same time to America, where the ideals of freedom and democracy, of innovation and renovation, were being carried out in a new and growing land. It has been stated that the movement began with the laity. It is more accurate to say that « the laymen renovated the worship; the rabbis reconstructed the faith » (1). Thus, in the United States, a Jewish congregation in South Carolina in 1824 adopted a Reform movement in the issuance of ten creedal articles which stressed monotheism, immortality, and good will toward all men as the children of God.

It was, however, through the constant and persevering efforts of two rabbis, David Einhorn and Isaac M. Wise, that the Reform gained momentum in the United States. These two men, who sometimes did not agree on specific issues, actually complemented one another in their separate and individual achievements over a wide area of the United States. Einhorn, from Germany, was the philosopher, advocating logic, doctrine, theory; he followed Schelling's concept of « the original primeval revelation of God to his understanding of Judaism » (2). He worked many years in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, spreading his ideas and ideals.

Isaac Wise, who centered most of his activity around Cincinnati, Ohio, was on the practical, realistic side, advocating the English language for everything, whereas Einhorn always preached in German. Wise accomplished great things in the practical realm. After he had founded many Reform congregations, he joined them

---

(1) « Reform Judaism in America », Solomon B. Freehof, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 45, p. 354 (April 1955).

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 355.

together in the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1873. He established the first American rabbinical seminary, the Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati, in the year 1875. As a result of his work the Central Conference of American Rabbis came into existence in 1889, a group of Reform rabbis who meet yearly to discuss problems and who occasionally, as in 1885 and in 1937, put forth general statements and explanations of the Reform, such as the « Pittsburgh Platform », and « Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism ».

Those who write about Reform Judaism insist on several points: first, that Reform is not a revolt, a heresy, or a schism; it is essentially part of Judaism; second, that Judaism is a religion of « deed rather than creed » (3). Hence, what the people do will ultimately lead them to what they believe, and *minhag,* the custom of the people, is « the creative power which (can) originate new practices in place of the old » (4).

One of the basic questions the early reformers and even those of today had to ask themselves was: ' Is every jot and tittle of the Law God-given or not? '. This would seem to be the heart of the controversy and the line of demarcation that splits the Orthodox and the Reform. The Reform claims that the basis for the whole Talmud is not transcendental and supernatural, but man-made and natural. Therefore, the Reform concludes, the customs and practices of Judaism are adaptable to the customs and practices of the people among whom it exists.

The « Pittsburgh Platform », issued by the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1885, expressed it this way:

« We recognize in the Mosaic legislation a system of training the Jewish people for its mission during its national life in Palestine, and today we accept as binding only its moral laws ... but (we) reject all such as are not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization ».

« We recognize in Judaism a progressive religion, ever striving to be in accord with the postulates of reason ... » (5).

This elastic concept of Judaism as an ever-changing and ever-changeable religion can be traced to David Einhorn's theory that « Judaism was *not* a system of Law, but a living doctrine *in* the Law and to be liberated from it for usefulness in modern life » (6).

---

(3) *Reform Jewish Practice and Its Rabbinic Background,* Solomon B. Freehof, (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1944) Vol. I, p. 3.

(4) *Ibid.,* p. 7.

(5) « Reform Judaism », David Philipson, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia,* Vol. VI, p. 241.

(6) Freehof, *Jewish Quarterly Review,* Vol. 45, p. 356.

There are special elements in the United States that have deeply affected the nature of the Reform and have helped to widen its growth and influence. These elements have existed since the beginning of the Reform in 1842, but they have particularly made themselves felt since World War II.

Formerly Jews banded together in ghettos where they lived, worked, and worshipped with only their own kind. These ghettos were mainly composed of poor people and often the neighborhoods were poor. But in the United States, where the middle-class of society enjoys a high standard of living, the Jews who were successful in business, shop-keeping, and professional life, moved out of the ghettos into middle-class, progressive, and social suburbs. Such suburbs were mainly Protestant, partly Catholic. Meeting and associating with their neighbors on a social and civic level created various problems for such Jews. One such instance would be Jewish children playing on the street on a Sunday morning while Protestant and Catholic neighbors went to church with their children. This and other similar problems had to be resolved by Reform Judaism, in order that the Jews might be considered thoroughly American and healthily modern in a population where they form but a three per cent minority.

The quarrel, if such it may be called, between Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Jews is not so much a matter of beliefs and doctrines, but of actual practice in carrying out their religion. True, the Reform has lax views of Biblical inspiration, disregards the coming of a personal Messiah, rejects bodily resurrection and the doctrine of Gehenna and Eden as abodes for everlasting punishment and reward. But, for the most part, all Jews are agreed on what they believe, basing themselves on the *Schema*: « Hear, O Israel, the Eternal, our God the Eternal, is one ».

Reform Judaism has dropped most of the the dietary laws and does not insist on the Sabbath rest. The fields in which the Reform has made the greatest contributions are synagogue architecture and synagogue arrangement, the relationship between the Jewish and the Christian community, and the status of women in Jewish life and worship. But the Reform so far has been unable to be creative in Jewish law and practice, and instead has limited itself to cutting or omitting or slightly revising existing laws and practices.

The following practices would represent important diversions from the Orthodox manner of practice ([7]).

([7]) See *passim* Solomon B. Freehof, *Reform Jewish Practice and Its Rabbinic Background,* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press). Vol. I, 197 pp., 1944. Vol. II, 129 pp., 1952.

The Reform observes the festivals according to Biblical custom, that is, one day instead of the Orthodox two. Weekly services are held late Friday evening (the best attended service). Sabbath morning, and also in some congregations on Sunday morning, for the practical reason that in the United States Saturday is a working and a shopping day and people are free on Sundays.

Both boys and girls are confirmed, in the belief that men and women are equal. Thus, women can be counted among the ten people needed for a religious service. A Reform temple has no gallery for the women and often the whole family sits together in a pew.

The Reform has introduced many changes into the Services; for example, it has modified the Memorial Service on the Day of Atonement, abolished certain ancient customs at marriages and funerals, started the reading of the Prophetic books in English, and shortened the reading of the Torah on the Sabbaths.

One of the major innovations in Reform has been the preaching of sermons at many of the services. Such sermons usually consist of an expounding of Sacred Scripture. Equally important would be the introduction of organs into the synagogues, stained-glass windows, the placing of the Bimah (for reading the Torah) on the front platform in the synagogue, the wearing of robes by the rabbi, the cantor and sometimes the choir members, and worshipping with uncovered heads.

Ancient Jewish Law had many regulations about marriage and divorce. Since individual states in the United States have specific laws governing marriage and divorce, the violation of which can often incur punishment, Reform Judaism on the whole regulates its marriage and divorce code by these civil laws. Civil marriages are considered to be valid but to lack God's blessing which would make them holy unions. Occasionally a board of three rabbis will investigate a divorce proceeding to see whether there is present any violation of good Jewish ethics. Remarriage after divorce is permitted. Mixed marriages (between a Jew and an unconverted Gentile) are not approved of, but intermarriage (between a Jew and a convert to Judaism) is of the same rank as any other Jewish marriage.

Converts to Reform Judaism have to be properly instructed before they are received, but they need not undergo the rite of circumcision or the ritual baptism.

After death the body of a Reform Jew will lie in state for two or three days. Flowers can be placed on the coffin. Some-

times cremation is practiced with permission and the ashes placed in a family plot or in a single grave.

As with any society that does not have a central authority with effective power to legislate and execute, so Reform Judaism has its problems that it is trying to face as time passes. The nearest it comes to a controlling power is the Central Conference of American Rabbis whose resolutions are adopted by a unanimous vote. Dissenters need not follow the majority but can hold to their own beliefs and practices. The only other authority spoken of is the *minhag*, the custom of the people, who « by their rejections and their acceptances, by their neglects and by their observances have largely determined their own religious practices » (8). However, having been for so long a time subject to the minutest details of laws and customs, the Jewish people now must decide what is of divine origin in their Law and what is man-made and dispensable.

Within the past several years there has been in Reform Judaism a slight trend towards traditional Judaism attributable, some say, to the great influx of East European Jews and their children into Reform congregations here in the United States. But Reform cannot swing back to Orthodoxy because « Orthodoxy will not go beyond the *interpretation* of *Halachah* (the totality of the demands of God) under any conditions; Conservatism prefers *selection* to interpretation, or at least makes it equally important. But Reform insists on its right, even its duty, to *rescind, amend,* and *modify,* to cut away some elements and enlarge others » (9).

Thus, Reform cannot return to Orthodoxy, and it has as yet been unable to devise a *Halachah* of its own. One of Reform's own critics says, « Reform's task is to develop a style of life, a set of commitments, a structure of meritorious deeds, in continuity with classical Jewish tradition and yet in keeping with our own times, in the spirit of a *minhag America* » (10).

The danger here is that the Reform is liable to lose its identity altogether as a facet of Judaism and that it will assume the shapelessness of some of the Protestant sects. It should be noted that for every innovation the Reform has introduced that resembles Christian customs or practices, the leaders have been able to adduce tradition, history, or custom as authority for the change.

---

(8) *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 13.

(9) « Reform Judaism Re-Appraises Its Way of Life », Israel Knox, *Commentary*, Vol. 18, p. 506 (December 1954).

(10) *Ibid.*, p. 510.

This must be done so that they do not reduce themselves to mere imitation of Christian sects.

But without specific, identifying customs and beliefs and pratices, and with a *credo* as vague and general as that expressed in the « Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism » (on God, Man, Torah, Israel, Ethics, Social Justice, Peace, Religious Life, Home, Synagogue, Education, Prayer), Reform Judaism indeed faces a dilemma. It has yet to find the direction of the road on which it has begun to journey.

De Sales Standerwick, S. A.

THE CONFERENCE AT TIOUMLILINE [1]

Tioumliline is the name of a spring, and of a narrow ridge its waters transect, high in the Middle Atlas mountains of Morocco. Panthers have been known to chase monkeys in the forests of cedars and pines on the mountains above; in the spacious valley below lies the town of Azrou. Almost equidistant from Tioumliline, seventy or eighty kilometers to the northwest and north respectively, are the royal city of Meknes and the sacred city of Fez. It is a country of strange and rapid contrasts. Veiled women ride motorcycles, and exorcisms are performed in front of hydroelectric plants. Nearby is a vista of jagged peaks capable of convincing one that he is on the moon; yet further on, towards Meknes, one encounters the trim, lush fields which nourish not only the best vineyards in Morocco, but also the cork-trees to go with them. It is a country, too, of Berber tribes, of spangled rugs and blue tattoos, of drums and fine leathers. It is a country, above all, of fervent Islam, of forbidden mosques and ragged holy men. It is an improbable place for a Benedictine monastery.

Five years ago, however, fifteen choir monks and five lay brothers from the Abbey of Encalcat in southern France, with Dom Denis Martin as their prior, settled on the ridge of Tioumliline. They came, as their brother Benedictines have come to countless other places on the earth during the past fifteen centuries, to pray and work. Occupying the single building which had appropriated the commanding view of the valley below, the monks began their monastic routine and began at once to expand.

A Dutch lay brother, who likes to apologize for never having designed a skyscraper, is responsible for the unique architecture of the present monastery buildings, conceived entirely in the modern spirit. The simple local work in stone and mortar is suitable to the Benedictine life and to the Moroccan scene, and is also artistically most satisfying. There are colored pools and flower-plots in odd geometric shapes all around the low-slung buildings, with Mondrian-like murals on the walls. The fat crucifixes in the monaste-

---

(1) Portions of this article first appeared in *The Commonweal*, and are republished with the kind permission of its editors.

ry chapel were painted by someone who sees the world like Jean Cocteau.

The monks of Tioumliline follow a strict observance of the Rule of St. Benedict. They are in fact a contemplative community, tonsured and completely silent. Their chief activities, after the *opus Dei,* have been and are the works of mercy. When they built a small dispensary, they found themselves treating as many as two hundred Berbers each day. When the prior took pity on and adopted several Moroccan orphan boys, they found themselves running a school of languages and useful trades. They did not proselytize; they chose to make their presence felt merely by their humble services. The significance of this decision was not lost on the local Arabs and Berbers, who bestowed upon the monks a title in which they justly rejoice; « The monks », they said, « are true Moslems ».

The monastic community grew to more than thirty and became, at the beginning of 1956, an independent priory. A less remarkable community might well have felt that it was doing all that it should and could do. It is only with considerable difficulty, however, that the outsider comes to learn what an entirely remarkable group of men they are; there are first-class scholars among them, talented artists and composers, and gifted translators. They are not the sort of men who would refuse even the heroic.

The particular mediatorial, pacifying tradition of Benedictinism had asserted itself at Tioumliline from the start. The monastery became a sanctuary for Independence (*Istiqlaal*) leaders, even fugitives. It became a refuge for Moslem students, especially those from the Qaraouine University at Fez, who welcomed the opportunity to quit the stifling alcoves and sunless streets of the cities for the peaceful freedom of Tioumliline. They came to study, to meditate, and to talk. When such an atmosphere grows up gradually and naturally, dialogue between Moslems and Christians is inevitable — a fact predicted by every great Christian thinker on Islam, but a fact which very, very few Christians have thought worth the testing.

So interesting and valuable were the extemporaneous discussions between Moslems and Christians at the monastery, particularly those during the difficult summer of 1955, that the monks decided to organize a conference for that very purpose the following summer. Centering around the general theme « The City », this conference compared Moslem and Christian concepts and circumstances. It was attended by more than one hundred students from nine countries, and by nearly forty lecturers from eight countries. Influential Moslem leaders were there, as well as two of the

greatest theologians in the Church, Charles Journet of Fribourg and Jean Daniélou of Paris. The success of this gathering was such that Dom Denis undertook an extensive tour of the United States, Canada, and Europe during the following year to enlist support for and to plan another and more ambitious conference. The theme for this second conference, « Education », had been suggested by Morocco's Crown Prince Moulay Hassan. The Sultan (now King) Mohammed V Ben Youssef, gave it his special patronage; so did the President of the Council, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of Education, the Governors and Super-Caids of various Moroccan districts, the Archbishop of Rabat, and the Ambassadors of France, Spain, and the United States. Held at Tioumliline from August 1 to 23 this past summer, the second conference is not likely to be forgotten by anyone who attended it.

The first thing that has to be said about the conference is that it was surely one of the strangest assemblies of human beings in the history of the world. There were nearly two hundred lecturers and students representing twenty-nine nationalities and six religions. But the naked statistics cannot do justice to the point. There was a Japanese who teaches philosophy in Germany, a Dutchman who teaches Spanish in Marrakesh, and a Spaniard who teaches music in Holland. There were poets, actresses, sociologists, theologians, photographers, seminarians, pharmacists, psychopathologists, and engineers. There were Belgians with Italian names, Arabs with English names, Germans with French names. There was a yellow-turbaned Moslem theologian from Fez who was actually a Frenchman, a folksinger in blue-jeans who was a priest. Protestant nuns, and a Persian from Harvard. There was an imam from a great mosque in Fez, the rector of the French College in Rome, and the son of the president of the World Zionist Organization. There were great Arabists and little Arabs. The representation from the United States ranged from the Ivy League and Fordham and Marquette to Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborn. There was a unique collection of beards, of religious habits, and oriental rites.

The division of the « sessionaires » into lectures and students was sometimes curious and awkward; there were professors of philosophy at distinguished universities, for example, who attended as students. There was also a class of persons called « free auditors » who obtained permission to attend the lectures. There were countless untabbed visitors. Most of the single lecturers and all male students were housed at Tioumliline itself, the lecturers in the guest-house and the students in what was called the « camp of chalets », a series of small cabins just below the monastery proper. The female students and married couples were housed at

Azrou. Meals (in the French manner, from *hors d'oeuvre* to Camembert) were taken at a refectory next to the camp.

During the first conference there had been five lectures each day; the second settled for two, and rarely three, leaving time for « sportive and cultural » activities in the afternoon, tea at five, « work seminars » before dinner, and entertainment in the evening. Although political meeting were strictly forbidden, there were special groups for persons interested in such things as sociology, liturgy, and Flamenco dancing, and one was forever hearing the scores of the « clerics against the laymen » at volleyball and ping-pong. The « work seminars » were conducted in various languages by the lecturers, always on the special theme of the week; they were small enough to permit active participation by all the students, and presented summaries of their results to the plenary session at the close of each week. Films, folk-singing and dancing, and theatrical offerings were the usual evening entertainments; Jews and Moslems sang Christmas carols in French, and Moroccans, Canadians, and Dutchmen danced Flamenco dances; one of the most successful plays was a comedy in Arabic presented by a group of actors from Marrakesh. The official languages of the conference were Arabic, French, and English; résumés of the lectures were sometimes, but not always, given in one of the other languages. In point of fact, of course, many languages were being spoken, and one occasionally had the feeling that no one was speacking his native tongue. Still, unaccountably, it was not Babel.

For most of the « sessionaires » the conference began at Casablanca on July 30. Seventy students had arrived there by boat from Marseilles, and were entertained in Lyautey Park by the impressive governor of Casablanca, Si Haj Ahmed Bargach, and other officials, at the first of many *diffas,* or Arab feasts. Those first encounters with the anatomy of an entire roasted sheep and the stolid mountains of « skoos-koos » may not have been overly successful, but no one was left unimpressed by Moroccan hospitality and graciousness. The governor gave a formal dinner that evening, and a reception at the French Embassy in Rabat followed the next noon. Then the group went on to Tioumliline.

The conference was inaugurated on August 1, in the presence of Archbishop Lefèvre and diplomatic representatives, by Prince Moulay Hassan. The Prince delivered a moving appreciation of the work of the monastery and the generosity of the visitors to his country; he gave a welcome to discussion and dialogue which was humble yet self-assured. Following the speech a *diffa* was given by the Berber tribes of the neighborhood of Tioumliline, and later in the afternoon Olivier Lacombe, Dean of the Faculty of Letters

at the University of Lille and a celebrated expert on India, opened the formal work of the conference with preliminary clarifications and distinctions on the subject (2).

The special theme of the first week was « Education, the perfecting of man toward the realization of his proper end ». It was a week for theory, particularly on « man and education » according to the many philosophies and religions represented by the members of the conference. Christian philosophy and theology were treated respectively by Professor Lacombe and Father Louis-Marie Régis, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Montreal. Two especially thought-provoking lectures of the week were those of Antoun Mekedesi, professor of philosophy at Damascus, on « Arab Culture », and André de Peretti, chief engineer of factories for the French government, on « Human Relations in an Industrial Milieu ». The week ended with a visit to Fez and the pool at Ain Schkef.

The second week's theme was « Education considered as an adaptation of man to certain historical and geographical circumstances ». The first lecture, on « The Meeting of East and West », was given by Professor F. S. C. Northrup of Yale. There was a general lecture on education in Islam by Louis Gardet, and lectures on two Moslem thinkers, Ibn Khaldun by Aurelio Vinas of the Hispanic Institute at the Sorbonne, and Mohammed Iqbal by myself. Augustinus Imamichi from Tokyo lectured on oriental humanism, and Father Marie-Martin Cottier of Basel lectured on Marxism. The towering figure of the second week, there can be no doubt, was Louis Massignon, professor at the Collège de France and dean of the world's Islamicists. His own lecture and seminars were not limited to a single facet of the problem, or even to a single culture, but extended, like his learning, over the entire range of time and space. This week ended with a long trip down through Midelt and Ksar es-Souk to Goulmima, on the edge of the desert.

The third week was devoted to « Aspects and techniques of education in the twentieth century ». Two formidable women captured the week: the King's daughter, Princess Lalla Aicha, who gave a controversial lecture on « The Emancipation of the Moroccan Woman », and sari-clad Ika Paul-Pont of the International Youth Center in Paris, who lectured on « Social Education in India ». There were also lectures on the press, the paradoxes of Moroccan education, psychology and education, the education of children, and education in the professions. After the closing session

(2) The proceedings of the second conference at Tioumililine will be published by review *Confluent*, published in Rabat.

of the conference, the « sessionaires » were warmly received by King Mohammed, who expressed his personal satisfaction in the results of the conference, at the royal palace in Rabat.

It is perhaps unnecessary to call attention to the superb hospitality of the Benedictines, since that virtue has characterized them in all places and at all times. From the first reception in Casablanca to the final audience with the King in Rabat, however, the hospitality of the Moroccans themselves, and their kindness, generosity, and good-will, were overwhelming. The high esteem in which the monks and the non-Moslem « sessionaires » were held by them was plain, too, for all to see. The King has often said that he hopes Morocco to be a kind of bridge between the Moslem and Christian worlds; obviously he means it. But more than that, he has a right to be proud of the manner in which his subjects have responded to his wishes by putting aside enmities and working for greater friendship with and understanding of other peoples. The Moroccan students at Tioumliline, for instance, were really the most impressive and attractive group of all. They had the initial advantage of feeling at home, but they employed it well to make fast friends of everyone. Very few of the conference, I should think, were denied the delight of visiting a « typical » Moroccan home in Fez, Meknes, or elsewhere, and of sitting on outsized cushions, sipping mint tea, and learning for themselves the charm and vitality of young-old Morocco.

Everyone was agreed, in fact, that the personal contacts were the most valuable result of the conference. It is possible, in the space of three weeks, to make more than passing friendships, and that is precisely what did happen. The education was mutual. The Moslems came to see Christianity in a new light, and the Christians came to see Islam for the first time in any light at all. One can only hope for more such mutual education, and hope against hope for the necessary time for it to take place. Yet agreement and friendship were certainly not produced at the price of honesty. There was no duplicity — or even soft-pedaling — for the sake of any bogus harmony; where viewpoints had to clash, they clashed. But the *esprit de corps* of the camp. the refectory, the lecture-hall, and especially of the entertainments and excursions, was unbelievable. Dignity was thrown to the winds; people made friends, they enjoyed themselves, and they talked and talked and talked.

It is not easy to criticize anything as uniquely worthy and important as the conference at Tioumliline. Still, it was not perfect. One was left wondering, for example, if the theme of the conference was at all adequately covered, and whether it was wholly suitable in the first place. Many of the lectures were dull; there was no

end of repetition and vagueness. There was not a single professor of education (although some might consider that an advantage) at the conference.

It was sometimes, and in many ways, uncomfortable; yet no one seemed to mind too much, except once when petrol was (by mistake) put into the salad. For many of the « sessionaires » there seemed to be much else mixed into the high purposes set for the conference: tourism, photography, language-practice, and even romance. The Ciné-club endlessly explained the obvious; the many « folklorique » evenings began to get on everyone's nerves. Yet none of these things was in the least the fault of the « sessionaires » themselves. Taken as a whole, the conference was a marvellous beginning, fully justifying the monks' hopes to make it an annual event. According to the advance information, the third conference will be an even more ambitious gathering on the subject « Progress and Tradition in Africa ». Three types of sessions (research for the experts, information for the students, and « Knowledge of Morocco » for both) will be held for a full two months in the late summer of 1958.

The monks, strange to relate, went on about their duties seemingly oblivious to the bustle of the whole world at their window-panes. They did not break their silence; not a single neum was dropped from their chants. Only two monks were in evidence: Dom Placid, the secretary of the conference, and Dom Denis, the prior. Dom Denis was the greatest figure at the conference, bar none. He was unforgettable. Everything seemed to hinge on him, yet he had time for everyone. His daily *Kaffeeklatsch* at the monastery was always a memorable occasion for those fortunate enough to be invited. He invariably sat on the floor, talking wittily and wisely, deceptively Socratic, staggeringly intelligent. He was also the reminder, to those who needed reminding, that the achievement of the conference must be written down, first and foremost, to the grace of God.

There were many symbolic sights during the conference. Many seemed to prefer the morning at Goulmima when the Moslems bowed toward Mecca, a Jew in a prayer-shawl sought out his solitude, and a Dominican celebrated Mass in a ditch. I myself preferred another, similar, but I think more basically symbolic, sight: that of the Berber soldiers and women welcoming their Princess with clucking and whooping, while the poor monks of Tioumliline, grouped around an altar in the forest below, were welcoming their King in silence.

James Kritzeck, Ph. D.
Princeton University

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

A letter of Pope Pius XII marking the fiftieth anniversary of the unity octave

It was fifty years ago that the January Octave of prayer for unity was first observed. It was at Graymoor, New York, in 1908 that Fr. Paul Wattson and his small religious community, then in the Anglican Church, inaugurated the period of prayer from January 18th to the 25th with the intention that separated groups of Christians might return to communion with the See of Peter at Rome. Since that time the Octave has been kept far and wide throughout the Catholic world, and in late years adaptations of it have likewise been given prominence among non-Catholic groups, particularly those making up the World Council of Churches.

To mark the fiftieth anniversary of this world-wide prayer movement which has been productive of much good in matters affecting Christian unity, Pope Pius XII addressed a letter of felicitation to His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York, in whose archdiocese the Society of the Atonement, founded by Fr. Paul, has its mother house. The text of the Pope's letter is as follows:

Almost fifty years have passed since the time that the religious institute in your archdiocese known (in English) as the Society of the Atonement, undertook the praiseworthy plan of beseeching God throughout eight days of public prayer to bring back, as soon as possible, as to a foresaken Mother, all those who have unhappily departed from the Unity of the Catholic Church.

This Octave which our Predecessor of happy memory, Pope Benedict XV, praised and indulgenced in the Apostolic Letter, *Romanorum Pontificium* (cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* IX 1917, 61-2), We likewise commend and We take this occasion to wish that this salutary and most useful endeavor may have greater success day by day and bear even more bountiful fruit.

Scarcely had We been raised to our Pontificate, then in the Apostolic Letter, *Summi pontificatus* (*AAS,* XXXI, 413 sq.) in which we opened to all Catholics our heart, moved by the dignity suddenly

conferred on Us and torn by deep anxieties, We wrote: « So you will put into practice the precept which our Divine Master gave us in that last sacred testament of His Heart towards Us ' that all may be one '. All are to live in the same bond of faith and charity, so that men may see the power and active influence of the Atonement Christ made, and of the labors for the Church which He founded ». (*ibid.* 452-3).

And so even though there may be numerous works of the apostolate to bring this plan into effect, nevertheless We believe that there is no better manner of accomplishing it than by offering humble and earnest prayer to God. For one must remember that Christ our Lord says: « Without Me you can do nothing » (Jn. 15:5) and also what the Apostle of the Gentiles declares and professes: « I have planted, Apollos watered, but God has given the growth. So then neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the growth » (I Cor. 3:6-7).

From these words it is evident to Us that while one must labor strenuously so that the light of the gospel may illumine the minds of all that they may return as soon as possible to the Unity of the Church founded upon the indestructible Rock of the Prince of the Apostles (Mt 16:18) so that the divine prayer may be fulfilled: « And there shall be one Fold and One Shepherd » (Jn. 10:16), yet it is necessary in the first place to beg this of God by loving and fervent prayer.

Especially by His divine light can the minds of men be illumined — minds to whom it often happens that they are drawn from the bosom of the Church, not through perversity; it also happens that through this heart-softening grace even perverse and stubborn wills may be changed and moved to embrace the full Christian truth.

We desire, therefore, that this Octave be spread everywhere in the world as far as possible. We desire also that the pious union erected by you, Our Beloved Son, the League of Prayer for Unity under the patronage of Our Lady of the Atonement, to which We granted indulgences a short time ago (cf. Res. Sac. Paenit. Apost. Off. de Indul. 557:56) may grow day by day in members, driven by the love of Christ who will desire nothing more than that all their separated brethren may happily return to the bosom of the Catholic Church. We desire to embrace everyone of them and We pour forth fervent prayers to God that they may return not to the house of a stranger but to the house of their common Father.

Meanwhile to you, Beloved Son, and to all who labor in these glorious works, We most affectionately in the Lord impart our

apostolic blessing as a mark of heavenly grace and as a pledge of our love.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's November 1, the feast of All Saints, in the year 1957, the eighteenth of our pontificate.

PIUS PP XII

* * *

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND DIVORCE

Divorce in Britain, a trickle in the second half of the nineteenth century, has become a flood which has already done irreparable harm to the national life and threatens to do still more in the future. The Anglican attitude to this evil is often criticised as ambiguous and inconsistent, but it is only fair to recognize that the corporate influence of the Church of England has been, and still is, a real and important check to the further spread of this erosive tide of divorce. While most non-Catholic bodies in England have long since ceased to offer any effective resistance to the practice, the Church of England continues, in the face of ever growing criticism, to maintain her ban on the remarriage in her churches of divorced persons who have a former partner still living. This ruling has been lately reaffirmed by an Act of Convocation.

There is no doubt that the Established Church's official disapproval of remarriage after divorce has had a considerable influence on public opinion, and has been one of the main factors retarding the spread of divorce in England and protecting the Christian ideal of marriage. Although only a relatively small number of Englishmen are still practising Anglicans, a large proportion still call themselves « C. of E. ». Even those who are no more than « four-wheeler Christians » — those, that is, who only go to their parish church in a pram to be christened, in a white-ribboned car to be married and in a hearse to be buried — still own a vague allegiance to the national church and manifest a rather embarrassed respect for it on the solemn occasions of life, private and public.

The fact that the local Anglican vicar will usually refuse to allow a divorced person to remarry in his church brings it home in a tangible way to people of little or no religious practice that there is not only something not quite respectable about such a marriage, but even something not quite right. Cherished family traditions, together with the surviving legacy of Christian ways of thought and conduct, explain why most English folk still want

the ceremonial of a church wedding, and to be denied it can be a very real sanction. If a certain social and moral stigma still attaches to divorce in many quarters, it is to a large extent due to the official attitude of the Church of England.

The courageous and much-publicised decision of Princess Margaret, the Queen's sister, not to marry a divorced man because it would be contrary to the Church's principles was a striking testimony to the power which Anglicanism still retains to uphold the sanctity of the marriage bond.

But there is another side to the picture. Divorce has by now acquired a strong vested interest, as it were, in the British social order. The law of the land provides relatively easy means for obtaining it, and what the State law allows the State church has no legal power to prevent. The civil divorce law, it is true, allows a Church of England incumbent the right to refuse to marry divorced persons, but it equally gives him the right to conduct such marriages if he feels so disposed, even against the will of his ecclesiastical superiors. Of this right a number of « liberal » clergymen avail themeselves, and the Church of England has no legal or canonical power to call them to order.

So many people, especially among the more influential and articulate sections of the nation, are now divorced, or are married to divorced persons, or have close relatives and friends who have remarried after divorce, that there is a powerful and increasing force of public opinion in favour of the practice and openly hostile to those who condemn it on moral and religious grounds. For many of these the decision of Princess Margaret seemed to be an implied criticism of their own conduct, and the Church of England, to whose teaching the Princess had declared herself loyal, was singled out as the target for their hostility. Newsreels showing the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was known to have advised the Princess, were hissed in London cinemas, and ever since that time a constant sniping at the Anglican bishops (with the motive often disguised) has been kept up by certain sections of the press.

Everyone in England knows, of course, that the Roman Catholic Church condemns divorce, but since Catholics are considered to be strict and strange in many ways, and since their discipline within their own fold does not have the same general social impact as the policy of the Established Church, their attitude does not arouse the same indignation. It would be shameful indeed if Catholics indulged in any *Schadenfreude* at this unpopularity of their Anglican brethren; rather we should give due honour to the many Anglican churchmen and layfolk who are fighting what is

also our battle, and who are incurring this odium in defence of the sanctity of marriage.

More disquieting, however, than this secular hostility, are the unmistakable signs that within the Church of England itself forces are at work which threaten to undermine its defence of the marriage bond.

Although the Convocations almost unanimously reaffirmed the canon forbidding remarriage after divorce, that unanimity by no means extends to the reasons for which the various parties assent to the traditional policy. On the one hand an influential party, who are called the « Rigorists » by their opponents and who draw much of their strength from the ranks of the Anglo-catholics, uphold the indissolubility of marriage as being the clear teaching of Christ, recorded in the Gospel and witnessed to by the main Christian tradition. For these, remarriage during the lifetime of a former partner cannot be a true and valid marriage, but is an objectively sinful union. This group hold that to rescind the Church of England's present discipline would be a betrayal of essential principles. Many others, however, especially among the Evangelicals, dissent from what they consider the too legalistic approach of the « Rigorists ». While agreeing that Christ's intention was that marriage should be a lifelong union, they do not consider that His teaching rules out the possibility of exceptions in hard cases. They agree that it is right for the Church of England to express official disapproval of divorce in her pastoral discipline, but they do not wish to pass a moral judgement on all subsequent remarriage. They prefer not to distinguish between « valid » and « invalid » marriages — terms which savour of legalistic and Romish notions — but rather between marriages which are spiritually successful or failures. In this view, as one writer puts it, « divorce is not impossible but wrong, and a second marriage, if based on penitence for the failure of the first, can be built into a true Christian marriage. Just as the murderer has really killed his victim, and cannot bring him back even by repentance, so the divorced person has really killed his marriage, and is not committing a new sin by marrying again » (1) . According to this way of thinking, the present Anglican prohibition of remarriage in church is merely a matter of pastoral discipline to safeguard the stability of marriage and to discourage divorce, so there would be no objection in principle to rescinding it if pastoral developments indicated the need for change. Many of those who hold this view think that such a change is now due. This « pastoral » party has already won a

(1) *Theology*, August 1957, p. 312.

significant success for their policy by getting Convocation to agree, under certain conditions, to the admission to the Holy Communion of people who have contracted a second marriage after divorce — a decision which marked a serious weakening in the hitherto firm policy of the Church of England.

The frontiers between these two groups do not always follow the usual lines of party cleavage, and there is a third force which seeks above all to prevent the division from becoming too sharply defined. The Archbishop of Canterbury's deft chairmanship well illustrates this attitude. These middle-of-the-road churchmen while inclining to the first opinion do not gainsay the second. They prefer to avoid dispute about the doctrinal inssues, and urge that the wisest policy for the present is the maintenance of the *status quo* and loyal acceptance of the time- honoured Anglican usage.

Both within and outside these main groups there are many other varying shades of opinion. The teaching of some Anglo-catholic theologians, who hold that Christian marriage is a sacrament, is practically the same as that of the Catholic and Roman Church, and they defend the Western tradition with vigour and learning. They favour the introduction of matrimonial courts in the Church of England to decide questions of nullity and similar cases. At the other extreme are modernists who defend divorce, and who assert that even if the Gospel text could be accepted as a genuine and reliable record of Christ's words on the subject, there is no assurance « that the historical Jesus was always infallibly right ».

A few Anglicans propose a « double standard »: one for Christian marriage, which should be indissoluble, another for secular marriage which should be legitimately dissoluble by the civil power. Protestant-minded churchmen are naturally influenced by a feeling of solidarity with the other Reformed churches of Europe, almost all of which admit remarriage in church after divorce. Some Evangelicals are sincerely persuaded that Christ's words in the Gospel allow divorce in the case of marital unfaithfulness. Others admit that His theoretical ruling permits no exceptions, but claim that in practice He Himself would be the first to mitigate its severity out of pity for unhappy souls whose first marriage has failed and who seek a new start in a second union. Others again say that His words in their context indicated the highest standard of Christian perfection, but were not meant to be taken as legislation to bind all, weak and strong alike.

The « liberal » churchmen are critical of Convocation as being unrepresentative of the broad mass of opinion in the Church of England, and like to draw a distinction between the narrow and

outdated policy of official Anglicanism and the human and realistic attitude of the more progressive clergy and laity. Assured of popular support from the large class who resent the stigma still attaching to the divorced, they aim at a reversal of the present prohibition of remarriage in church, which in any case they do not regard as binding on themselves. Achievement of their aim would be quite possible if they could win the active support of the « pastoral » party who accept the present discipline on grounds not of doctrinal principle but of practical expediency. This party are already showing themselves sensitive to the accusations of legalism and intolerance, and to the pleas for compassion and broad-mindedness. Even without a formal revocation, the official ban could in time be rendered ridiculous and ineffective if a sufficiently large number of clergymen exercised their statutory right to disregard it.

In recent months these internal tensions have become openly apparent. The event which brought the controversy to a head was the marriage of an Anglican vicar in the diocese of Worcester to a divorced woman whose first husband was still living. The ceremony was performed by another Anglican incumbent, who had made a practice of conducting the marriages of divorced people in order to demonstrate the legal right of clergymen to do so. With the disapproval of his bishop but with the support of many of his parishioners the newly married clergyman announced his intention of retaining his living, thereby setting a new precedent. The press naturally made the most of this titbit of news, which seemed to give the lie to the official Anglican policy.

« Is there no discipline in our church, no authority by which such an act can be condemned? » asked an indignant correspondent in the *Church Times*. The editor of the *Church of England Newspaper*, on the other hand, saw a chance to make capital out of the affair at the expense of the « Rigorists »:

> « One pernicious myth », he wrote, « has been exploded. It has often been maintained with more zeal than honesty that remarriage after divorce is contrary to the law of the Church. That can no longer be said with even the appearance of plausibility ».

Four days later the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his presidential address to the Convocation of the southern province, retorted:

> « But indeed it can be said and must be said, because it is true. Remarriage after divorce, whether in church or not, is allowed by the law of the land. The law of the Church in the matter was last expressed in the canons of 1603, which expressly laid down that the parties separated by divorce ' shall not

during each other's life contract matrimony with any other person '. That is still the law of the Church. It has been overruled and outdated by the law of the land, but not changed ».

The Archbishop proceeded to promulgate as an Act of Convocation its previous resolutions concerning remarriage and divorce. Next day the Lower House of Convocation, with only one dissentient, passed a resolution of « warm support » for Dr. Fisher's statement and action.

The « liberals » and their allies, however, were far from satisfied, and took special exception to one remark of the Primate. While admitting that, in the face of statute law behind which insubordinate clergymen could shelter, the Church of England could apply no canonical sanction to call them to order, he had warned them that « in a matter of such public and pastoral urgency priests who disobey these regulations of Convocation do so at their own spiritual peril ». This hint of spiritual sanctions, overriding the law of the land by which the Church of England is established, drew indignant protests. Among these was a letter to the press signed by thirty-nine clergymen of the diocese of Birmingham, asserting that the « liberal » attitude to remarriage after divorce had wide support in the Church, and declaring that they « strongly resented the Archbishop appearing to give that Act of Convocation the semblance of Papal authority ».

> « Does the Archbishop realize », they asked, « the deep distress he has caused to many clergy and laity by calling up the bogy of ' spiritual peril ' to frighten the clergy from exercising what is their undoubted legal and moral right? »

The Archbishop replied to his critics, withdrawing the offending phrase about « spiritual peril » but repeating his insistence that the Church's official directions ought to be loyally observed.

Since then the debate has continued in the press and in private, in the Church Assembly, in diocesan conferences, in parishes and in the country at large. The controversy about remarriage has been extended to include wider issues, such as the status of Convocation, the concept of spiritual authority in the Church of England, and the relations between the Established Church and the State. These developments cannot fail to have repercussions on the delicate matter of the revision of the obsolete canon law of the Church of England, now in active preparation. One of the committees set up for the 1958 Lambeth Conference is concerned with « The Family in Contemporary Society », and it will be interesting to compare the comments of churchmen from other branches of the Anglican

communion, where the social pattern is often very different from that in Britain.

One thing seems certain — that the pressure to obtain a change in the marriage discipline of the Church of England will grow greater in the years ahead, rather than less. Any further weakening of that discipline would result in a further weakening of the moral health of the nation as a whole. Catholics will surely assist with their prayers and sympathy the group of catholic-minded Anglicans who are the real strength of the defence of the traditional standards, and who are maintaining ,in the face of misrepresentation and unpopularity, the true Christian concept of marriage.

Fr. Francis Clark, S. J.

* * *

Protestants in Pennsylvania

Among the many interesting features of the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate held in Rome early in October were carrefours *dealing with various fields of particular import for the laity. One of these* carrefours *was dedicated to the problems of Christian unity and was presided over by the late Bishop Calavassy, Apostolic Exarch for the Byzantine Rite Catholics of Greece. At this symposium, speakers from different European countries and elsewhere presented surveys on the religious situations in their respective areas, and discussions on the points brought up ensued.*

As characteristic of the American scene, we are reproducing below a paper delivered at this Congress meeting by an American delegate, Fr. Joseph E. Kerns, S. J., stationed at present at the Bellarmino College in Rome:

Though I have no particular competence as a theologian to discuss church unity, I was born and raised in a part of the United States where that subject comes easily to mind. Pennsylvania, first settled by a group of Quakers, is a traditionally Protestant state. Though its Amish country people with their black beards or long skirts and old-fashioned bonnets, are rarely seen in other states, and groups like the Baptists, so prominent in other states, have no great influence in Pennsylvania, the state is a fairly representative sample of American Protestantism today. You can hardly live in it without forming some impressions on the questions of church unity. Here are a few of my own.

To label the Protestants in Pennsylvania as Lutherans, Episcopalians, etc. is to tell very little about them. The only reason why some go to the Methodist church is that it is the closest to their house or they happen to like the Methodist minister's preaching. Those who, if asked their religion, would call themselves Protestants, seem rather to fall into three groups.

The first is the group that used to be typical. Its members range from theologians, sincere, educated, convinced of their position, to busy ministers who despair of settling points like the divinity of Christ but are convinced that there is something valid in the Protestant way of life, to quiet middle-class families who have never known anything but their own sect and think it satisfies their longing for God as well as any other could, to grim zealots like a businessman in my own home town who tries to pick arguments with Catholic high-school students and has furnished an office as a « Conversion Center of Priests and Nuns ». All of these, whatever be their differences, have one belief in common: The Catholic Church is mistaken in its teaching and does as much harm as good.

The second group, much smaller, is composed of intellectuals and others who consider themselves as such. Their creed is: « God, and that's all ». As they see it, Kant and Darwin and Einstein and Freud have made it impossible for a thinking man to consider as facts what Christian churches say about God. If you want to shut your eyes and make a leap called « faith » into a world that gives some comfort in misfortune, well and good. This depends on your emotional need for such support.

They look on convinced Baptists or Presbyterians as people who have not had enough education to be bothered in their beliefs. Toward ministers their attitude is often the contempt reserved for men who should know better. They regard them as either intellectual nobodies or fanatics defending a vested interest.

As they see it, the Catholic Church is slightly better because slightly more consistent, and yet much worse because it represents the tyranny of a few strong wills over many weaker ones. Most of them would agree with the assessment that appeared in one American book:

> They can never beat us. There has to be a refuge for the mass of men who cannot think. The Church is that. We say, « Come to us all ye that are bewildered and in despair of understanding, and we will tell you what to believe and do and think ».

There are times when respect for a priest who strikes them as quite unselfish or friendship with a Catholic scholar makes them

feel the pull of the Church. But they smile these feelings away. Their education has taught them to center on questions, not answers. They are sincerely humble and tolerant in their own way. They will respect an opinion — but never follow it. Theirs is the weakness of the uncommitted mind. They never take a conclusion, even one of their own, seriously enough to stake their lives upon it.

The third group is by far the largest. No one can say reliably how many belong to it, but few would deny that the member of this group is the typical American Protestant. And the most typical thing about him is that he is no longer Protestant at all. The issues that inflamed men like Luther or Wesley mean nothing to him. There is only one way to explain him. Quietly, even unconsciously, he has lost all belief that God, at one point in history, aided our groping efforts to find Him by revealing Himself.

A good man, convinced that there is a God and trying to live as he thinks we should in the light of this fact, he supports every good cause and looks with tolerance on any religion that does not seem too far-fetched. This not indifference. It is logic. If there was no revelation, then each of us has to form his own idea of what God is like; and one man's guess is as good as another's. He will tell you, « We're all going to the same place by different roads ».

Many of these people feel no need of going to church, except perhaps at Christmas, which is a time for realizing how good the world would be if we would love one another, and Easter, when the warm spring weather reminds us that, with a good God running the world, we should live in hope. Those who do attend services fairly often may always go to the same church or move from one to another, depending on what they feel they need and the minister's ability to supply it. The ideal religion to them is that of one minister who advertises: « No dogma. No ritual. No collection ».

The attitude of a man in this group toward Catholics may have been soured slightly by zealously Protestant parents or a minister's tirades against « Romanism »; but he detests bigotry, whether in himself or others, and is quite willing to admit any good he finds in Catholics. To traditional Protestantism the symbol of all evil is the Pope — but not to this man. In fact, the one who has probably done most to lead American Protestants toward a more kindly view of the Church is our present Holy Father. He is known and respected by more of them than any living Protestant leader. An upstate village like Wernersville, where the « Pennsylvania Dutch » are noted for their simple but tenacious beliefs, includes families who point with pride to a son or nephew who « saw the Pope of Rome ». I wonder if even the Holy Father reali-

zes the effect of those audiences for the motley crowds of American service men during the War.

This quiet respect extends to priests. Celibacy is always impressive, and a priest receives more courtesy in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh than in many Catholic cities I have visited. Nuns are a mystery to them. But one superior, whose convent is in the worst slum of Philadelphia, remarked, « Even the drunks tip their hat to us, if they still have one ». Millions of these Protestants have watched Bishop Sheen on television and told their friends to see *Going My Way,* a movie which claimed to show a typical Catholic parish. One dentist from Philadelphia wrote to a former patient of his who had left home to be a Jesuit novice, « Here's five dollars. Be a good novice, and be a good priest like Bing Crosby ».

But this picture of Protestantism in Pennsylvania would not be accurate unless it were set beside a view of the Church. The American Catholic Church is stronger today than it has ever been before. My own parish in suburban Philadelphia, that had one priest and 300 families when I left for the novitiate, was split twice but still needed three priests and a school for 1100 children by the time I was ordained.

And this is not just because people are moving to the suburbs. In the ten largest cities of the United States 55 % of all babies born are baptized Catholics. Upstate Pennsylvania has long been a Protestant stronghold; but Reading is full of abandoned churches, and even in Gettysburg, which has a famous Protestant seminary, it is doubtful whether all the Protestant churches together have as many worshipers on Sunday as St. Francis Xavier's.

Now, Protestants cannot help but sense this growing power, and they are afraid of it. Not only the minister but many who do not take their own religion very seriously, feel uncomfortable about the changes they see around them. The things they remember hearing about the Spanish Inquisition, their mistaken idea of the Legion of Decency, newspaper accounts of alleged persecution in countries where the Church is the state religion, make them wonder what would happen to them « if the Catholics take over ».

Many Catholics are also uneasy. The remarkably similar wording of protests from different sections of the country in the Hildy McCoy and Connecticut school-bus cases, the utterances of people like Paul Blanchard or G. Bromley Oxnam, the tone of many gatherings in the newly-organized yearly commemoration of Martin Luther are only the more obvious signs of what looks like a new and well organized anti-Catholic campaign.

This one is more subtle than the others. They talk of patriotism, not religion. They want to defend American freedom from

a power group plotting to destroy it. Now, most Americans would laugh at the idea of Frank Leahy, Lawrence Welk, the nuns in St. Joseph's Hospital and Princess Grace of Monaco as members of a conspiracy to rule the United States; and these Protestant leaders know it. So they profess great respect for Catholic worship and a great love of « their Catholic neighbors ». The dragon they call upon all true Americans to slay is « the hierarchy » — a word which to many well-meaning Protestants suggests Latin-speaking prelates in sinister robes plotting world dominion while clever priests use the confessional to brainwash the cringing faithful into complying with « Vatican foreign policy ».

Only a relatively small group today are influenced by such talk, but if these men ever succeed in moving the great good-willed and unconcerned mass of those who still call themselves Protestants, the American Catholic Church may be in for a real persecution.

This somewhat complicated picture of American Protestantism suggests a few conclusions. The first is prudence. Catholics in other countries must realize that articles on Church and State are carefully noted in the United States. This is not a suggestion that truth be veiled or progress in theology halted. But articles suggesting that basic changes are desirable in the Church's relations with the government of the United States would be neither good sense nor good theology.

Those who represent the teaching Church have already spoken, not just in general terms, but explicitly about the United States. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore went on record as saying, « We consider the establishment of our country's independence, the shaping of its liberties and laws, as a work of special Providence ».

American bishops have repeated time and time again the words of James Cardinal Gibbons:

> American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State; and I can conceive no combination of circumstances likely to arise which should make a union desirable either to Church or State. We know the blessings of our present arrangement; it gives us liberty and binds together priests and people in a union better than that of Church and State ... We do not believe our system adapted to all conditions; we leave it to Church and State in other lands to solve their problems for their own best interests. For ourselves, we thank God we live in America.

If there were any theological error in these views, it would have been pointed out to the American hierarchy long before now.

But instead, there are statements like the letter of Leo XIII, who had been sent a copy of the American constitution by President Cleveland:

> We desire that you should assure the President of Our admiration for the Constitution of the United States, not only because it enables industrious and enterprising citizens to attain so high a degree of prosperity, but also because under its protection, your Catholic countrymen have enjoyed a liberty which has so confessedly promoted the astonishing growth of their religion.

A different kind of prudence is necessary for American Catholics. The sadder pages of history show us that the Church has always been sought as the last refuge of dying causes. Politicians proclaim, « You can't be a good Catholic unless you belong to my party ». Professors try to stifle all objections to their theses by calling them « Catholic philosophy ». In the United States today this temptation has more attractiveness than ever before. Catholics are becoming a power. Both political parties feel it wise to give them one post on the President's cabinet. A city like Pittsburgh makes it a point to have at least four Catholics on the city council.

So far, both clergy and laity have refrained from using the Church for their own personal advantage. And with good reason. Winning a battle might mean losing the war. All that the professed anti-Catholics need to sway the mass of uncommitted Protestants is a few examples of ecclesiastical arm-twisting. The Church's goodness and beauty, when seen by themselves, are enough to show men that it comes from God; and we can do it no greater harm than creating the impression that becoming a Catholic means joining this political party or this school of philosophy or adopting this group's solution to temporal problems which God left us to solve without the help of His revelation.

Since many excellent writers have discussed our approach to the Protestants I have listed in my first and second group (the convinced members of a sect and the intellectuals), I chall confine myself to one suggestion. A question that should be discussed more often is how to help Protestant ministers. The truth of the Church can be seen clearly enough when looked at calmly. But conversion, a frightening prospect to any adult, is more frightening when it means that a man who has always been in the pulpit must now sit in the pews, that one whose training and experience have fitted him for only one position must take his chances of finding another way to support a wife and children, that a love which finds its natural expression in leading others toward God

must be content to let someone else do the leading and just be one of the crowd. There is no magic formula for solving this problem, but I think we might discuss it more than we do.

This brings us to the third group, the vast majority of non-Catholic Americans. I do not want to belittle the necessary labors of Catholic scholarship, but I think we should realize that, as far as the United States is concerned, to center most of our effort on studies of Protestant theology or discussions with Protestant theologians is a tactical error. The typical American who calls himself a Protestant does not know what Protestant theologians hold, and doesn't care. Those who only attend the church of one denomination are often no more alike than those who take same book from a library, each looking for something different, depending on his intellectual background.

Protestant ministers as a group have lost their hold on their people. Read the religious notices of a paper like the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*. Notice the way the service is described and the topic selected for the sermon. It is an appeal, not an announcement. And the appeal lies not so much in the message as in the personality of the man who delivers it. American Protestantism moves by drifting, not direction. The tactical approach is to bypass the ministers and appeal directly to that vast body who are Protestant only in the sense that they are not Catholics.

There are some general features of their belief that we should bear in mind when making this appeal. The first is that to the American Protestant, religion is often a feeling, a physical emotion. If he is a man, especially one whose work keeps him busy, he will tell you he is not religious. What he means is that he is not emotional. He does not usually have that feeling. Humbly assuming that this is his own fault, he figures that the only thing he can do is to be decent to other people and hope that God will look on him with pity when the day of reckoning comes.

He goes to church at least for Christmas and Easter because those are the times he especially wants that feeling. He listens to Billy Graham because Billy seems to know how to work it up. When he says that he's « got religion », what he has gotten is that feeling, a warm tearful sense of God's goodness and mercy. This is what he « testifies » to when he rises from his place in the revival and goes up the middle aisle to declare himself converted. The section of apologetics that we need to develop today is not so much the probative value of « Thou art Peter, etc. » as a clear set of principles like St. Ignatius Loyola's Rules for the Discernment of Spirits.

The second aspect of an American Protestant's religion is a deep humble desire for union with God. This is why he regards becoming a Catholic as unthinkable. Priests and dogmas look like a wall between God and the soul. One of the best ways I have heard of for presenting the faith to him is the system one pastor uses when instructing his converts. Protestants have a deep appreciation of prayer, especially affective prayer. He tells them, « I'll teach you how to pray. You say, ' Our Father ... ' Now, this is what we Catholics mean by ' Father ' ... ' Who art in heaven '... This is what heaven is like, etc ». Going from this to the other common prayers, he gives them a complete set of instructions.

For these people our greatest selling point is the Blessed Sacrament. They want God. We have to show them that they can have Him in a far more intimate way than they have ever dreamed of. We have to keep insisting that what the Church has to give them is not just a set of doctrines. It is a Person, and a Person who is physically present a few yards down the street in the Catholic church.

One final observation is the one that I think most important. To American non-Catholics the most powerful argument for any group or any body of thought is the one Our Lord suggested: « By their fruits you shall know them ». Ralph Waldo Emerson phrased that truth the way most Americans see it: « What you are speaks so loudly that I can't hear what you say ».

JOSEPH E. KERNS, S. J.

★ ★ ★

JUDAISM SEEKING ITSELF

A Report of the recent ' Ideological Conference ' at Jerusalem

An ' Ideological Conference ', hailed as the most important Jewish event since the establishment of the State of Israel, was held at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in August this past year. Its aim was « to re-examine the essentials of Zionist thinking, to take stock of Zionist achievements and failures, to do away with outlived notions and terminology, and to define Zionism's present contents and tasks in the light of post-State realities ». About seventy leading Zionist thinkers, — University professors, writers, theologians, and politicians — from America, Europe, and Israel met to present their often greatly divergent views. In the words of the organizer, Mr. Shazar, the purpose of the Conference was to exchange views, not to agree. Your correspondent had the

privilege of assisting at some of the sessions of this remarkable conference, the only representative — as it seemed — of the Gentiles.

The basic paper was read by Professor N. Rottenstreich, head of the Department of Philosophy at the Hebrew University. He described the change that has occurred in Jewish reality during recent generations in which the Jewish people has ceased to view itself as following its own particular direction, stretching from Revelation to the End of Days, and has been inserted into the history of the world in its ordinary, everyday course. The basis for this change is, according to Dr. Rottenstreich, that the character of human history has ceased to be interpreted as a Christian history in the specific acceptation of this term and has become a political history of nations. It is by the very structure of the states in question that the Jews have been integrated into them, not through a fight waged by Jews. The epitome of the process of integration of the Jews into world history is the establishment of an independent Jewish State.

The question to face now is whether Jewish striving is to go no further than the attainment, still only partially achieved, of political status and human rights in all countries. Professor Rottenstreich denied this possibility. The achievement of a full human domain for Jews is only a presupposition for their creative mission — for the making of Judaism into a « living seed ».

Another presupposition, still lacking, is the building up of a complete universe of ideas, beliefs, and spiritual values, linking the sphere of faith and the sphere of action, the sphere of the group and the sphere of the individual, the sphere of the world and the sphere of the nation. According to the speaker, Christianity has long since achieved this ideological preparation. In recent generations, however, certain basic ideas have emancipated themselves from the Christian context, ideas such as the liquiditation of poverty, the promotion of welfare, human rights for everyone; and it is exactly through these common property ideas that it has become possible to be assimilated to the world without apparently relinquishing Judaism. This situation is a challenge because any blurring of differences endangers the existence of a people that is constituted through those differences. Dr. Rottenstreich warned that the emancipation of the world from Christianity is incomplete in so far as world politics is still conducted on a salvational level, and he regretted that a variety of the salvational interpretation of politics is to be found also in present-day Zionist polemics, represented by David Ben Gurion. A clear distinction, he said, between the level on which we live and the salvational level is needed.

Apparently as a reaction to the Conference's endeavour to for-

mulate a Jewish message that transcends the fact of Israel, M. Ben Gurion, who according to Professor Martin Buber stands for an « excessive secularization », proclaimed it his policy « to go to the Jewish people with the Bible ». Dr. Nahum Goldman, the leader of World Zionism had only contempt to spare for this pious proclamation: « What is this naive conception of going to the Jewish people with a Bible in the hand? Is that a political programme? ».

★ ★ ★

The relation between the Israeli Jews and the Diaspora Jews and in particular the danger of a too great assimilation of the latter into gentile culture occupied a large part of the papers read to the Conference. Dr. Raphael Mahler, a Polish historian now living in the United States, expressed the view that the only choice for a Jew is between return to Israel and assimilation. This ultra-Zionist tendency to consider the Jews who remain in their present nations as second-class Jews, and even as traitors to the cause of Judaism as identified with Israel, found most eloquent opposition among the delegates.

Dr. Cecil Roth of Oxford University and Professor Oscar Hanlin of Harvard University tried to explain to the ultra-Zionists the true position of English and American Jews. Dr. Roth established the fact that the Jew had been fully welcomed into the national unity of England and had reached places of national distinction without ever being asked to deny his Judaism. He warned that the English Jew is only prepared to support Israel as long as its cause is morally right, and he regretted that the State of Israel has had three incidental effects: it has abolished the International Jew with his vast potentialities; it has weakened the Anglo-Jewish community by the migration of the most eager elements among the youth; and it has brought forward a new element in Anglo-Jewry among whom the only yardstick is the size of their contribution to Zionist funds. The latter point was also made a matter of complaint by an American delegate who compared the appeals for money with the medieval sale of indulgences!

Professor Hanlin boldly self-defined himself an assimilated Jew who is not and has not been a Zionist. He was convinced that a Jew could lead a full Jewish life outside Israel and said that for Jews in the United States it was false to talk of a ' minority status '. We can only talk of a minority when there is a majority, and in the pluralistic United States no such majority exists. American Jews feel Israel worthy of their support, as they are willing to help all Jews — even the Israeli Jew who wants to go to America —

and as they are anxious to support the honest efforts of good people everywhere. The view of Dr. Hanlin probably represented the extreme limit of Zionist toleration. The American Council for Judaism that explicitly excludes political aspirations from Judaism was not invited to the Conference and was the subject of disparaging remarks.

The Diaspora issue was crystallized in the question of Yiddish versus Hebrew. The Zionist authorities were reproached for their efforts to replace Yiddish, the common language of the Diaspora Jews, with Hebrew, the official language of Israel. It was pointed out that such a policy could only force the Diaspora into assimilation, for of a thousand families abandoning Yiddish, only one family could be expected to embrace Hebrew, while the rest would settle for an all-English culture.

Israel's temperamental Prime Minister apparently got rather vexed by the strong voices raised in defence of the Diaspora. Addressing a group of visiting students, during the course of the Conference, he declared that if certain champions of English are Zionists, then he was not a Zionist. It was as if the Pope had declared himself an anti-Catholic, and it deeply shocked the delegates. « Ben-Gurion, the super-Zionist, the arch-critic of the Diaspora, says he is no Zionist », exclaimed Dr. Nahum. « And why? Because there are many Zionists he doesn't like. Then why doesn't he tell them they are bad Zionists? ».

★ ★ ★

The most important question of the Conference was the definition of the exact nature of the Jewish message to the world. Dr. Rottenstreich raised the question, but he only vaguely suggested that it is an alternative to Machiavellism on the one hand and to optimistic utopianism on the other — an ideology more rational and universal than Christianity and more in accord with the rights of man than the Asian religions.

Is the Jewish message dependent on the idea of God? Mr. Eliezer Goldman claimed that the very fact that Israel takes for granted the concept of duties of the Jews of America towards Israel, implies the concept of a convenant on a theological plane. Professor Abraham Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, said that « a Jew who does not believe in God denies the Jewish people ». This greatly scandalized Mr. Yitzhak Tabenkin, the leader of the *Ahdut Ha-avoda,* who protested that « I believe in man » ... « A life of holiness is one of work and sweat, of equality, and internationalism ».

Dr. Julius Braunthal, of England, held the opinion that the pattern of the perfect socialist society was emerging from the *Kibbutsim* of Israel. The most outspoken secularist present, however, was Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz, who told the delegates that neither the Bible, nor some Messianic mission, nor an ethical message could constitute the basis of Jewry. The basis is the great prose of daily life, a sociological reality built on the *Halacha* (law) and the *Siddur* (prayer book). « The Bible is second-class literature and third class philosophy ». It is the *Halacha* that transforms its 24 books into Holy Writ. The Jewish State is built on a completely normal patriotism. « We don't know if it is an act of divine providence, but we know that we built it in a certain situation ». On this basis Professor Leibowitz pleaded that religion should not be a function of the State, and he characterized the clause in the declaration of independence that made the State religious as « disgraceful ». It was interesting to note that this talk was applauded by about one third of the audience.

The only speaker who was regularly booed was Mr. Hillel Kook (Peter Bergson) when he said that theocracy in Israel was advanced to the point of Fascism. It would be better to have a « Jewish Vatican », he said, than to make a Vatican out of the whole country. In the view of Mr. Kook, Israel should not be a branch of world Jewry, but an independent unit, a secular Mediterranean Sea power, normal as every other State.

Some of the speakers warned that in the identification of Judaism with Israel was hidden a contempt for the great significance and value of the life and sufferings of the Jews since the days of the dispersion. In the words of Mr. H. Leivick, the American Yiddish poet and dramatist, this un-historic attitude implied a disparagement of the Jews who died in the gas chambers. In a moving talk he recalled the fear that he had felt as a seven-year old boy at the thought that the angel who halted the hand of Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac might have come too late. Isaac the victim was the true picture of the Jewish people, and again and again the angel has come too late. In their patient sufferings the Jews had accepted a most noble mission in world history, and Mr. Leivick was sorry to see so much in the new order of things that denied this mission and this dignity.

Mr. Leivick's profound intuition might have raised the fundamental question of whether the whole movement of political Zionism with its State of Israel might not represent a gigantic deviation of the Jewish people from its God-given path. It appeared that none of the persons present was prepared to face this question. Very significant things were, however, said in some of the talks.

Dr. Joseph B. Schechtman, for instance, had the following to say in a talk on the variant meaning of Zionism: « It seems pertinent to remind in this context that the first and foremost ideologists and leaders of modern Zionism — Pinsker and Herzl and Nordau and Jabotinsky, as well as some of the Zionist leaders nowdays, have been products of partial, often far-reaching assimilation. And political Zionism as such — please don't be shocked — is to a very great extent ' assimilationist ' in its very concept. I think it was Perez Smolenskin who in his polemics with early ideologists of assimilation wrote: — ' You say that we Jews have to be like all other nations; let us have a language of our own, a country and a state of our own, a flag and an army. Let us be *K' chol ha' goyim!* ' Zionism lived up to this challenge. While negating and vigourously combatting atomizing assimilation of Jews as *individuals*, Zionism modeled its concept of Jewish national normalcy in conformity with the pattern of the *collective* way of life of non-Jewish nations ». So far Dr. Schechtman.

Dr. Schechtman's picturing of the Zionist past found an impressive confirmation in a genuine veteran of those pioneering years, the venerable, white-bearded Jacob Zerubabel, who rose to his feet to express his deep worry about the problems presented at the Conference. « Fifty years ago we were all young. We did not meet in Jerusalem, but in some baker's hall. We did not ask why we were Jews; we didn't ask if we need to be Jews. We asked what can be done to stop this ugly life ».

* * *

We others, the Gentiles, who wish our Jewish brethren in Abraham well cannot but be preoccupied with the fact that the great task of the establishment of a Jewish State has been based on what appears as fundamentally non-Jewish ideas, alien to Revelation. If, however, the State of Israel religiously speaking is a mistake, then we should not fail to recognize our own responsability. We have so often failed to give them a place in our hearts and have thereby forced them into the Ghetto of Israel — at the expense of the Arabs. We have been blind towards them and have failed to see their real place in God's design for mankind.

EDWARD VOGT

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Christian Unity Discussed at World Congress for the Laity

As was noted elsewhere in this issue, one of the workshops at the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate held at Rome in October was dedicated especially to the cause of Christian unity. Under the presidency of the late Bishop George Calavassy of Athens and the co-chairmanship of Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., editor of *Unitas,* reports and impressions on the subject were presented by various delegates from the United States, Belgium, France, Spain, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Bulgaria.

Typical of the points discussed was the schema prepared by the Foyer Oriental Chrétien of Bruxelles which posed the problem thus: « The question of the unity of the Church is a *vital* question; this is what conditions the efficacy of our apostolate among non-Christians, for the division of Christians is certainly the greatest scandal and the most formidable obstacle to our work of spreading the Gospel: the very value of the Message is compromised by the disunion of its apostles ».

The outline went on to bring the problem of disunity into relief particularly from the point of view of the laity which in very many cases found itself in constant contact with Christians of other denominations, and was insufficiently prepared to confront the situation. It further stated that the efforts of theologians and experts in the field of Christian unity would come to naught unless the laity were to co-operate in the breaking down of psychological barriers. The schema likewise placed emphasis on the fact that the majority of non-Catholics had no other contacts with the Catholic Church other than with its laity; and conversely, that quite often the only possibility the Church had to address herself to separated Christians was through the instrumentality of the laity.

The document next dealt with the difficulties facing Catholic laymen in the role they were called upon to play and stressed the principal stumbling-blocks to be avoided. These were: silence and inaction; indifferentism and excessive tolerance; intolerance and rigorism; and imprudent proselytism.

Calling upon laymen to become conscious of the serious responsibility which is theirs, the paper outlined their duty as consisting in:

1. Genuine concern for the scandal of separated Christians.
2. Prayer - especially intensive supplication during the January Week of Prayer.
3. Becoming and keeping well-informed on the numerous aspects of the problem of unity — particularly by associating with unity movements, by consulting specialized persons, pertinent reviews, and other literature.
4. Being in a position to inform others of the Catholic standpoint so as to obviate the major obstacle presented by misunderstanding and prejudice.
5. Respect and obedience towards the authority established by God to govern His Church.

The outline concluded by suggesting concrete means of actualizing the role of the Catholic laity: the placing of particular emphasis on the question of unity in cathechisms, in the school, the family, the parish, and in study groups; and by appropriate use of the media of the press, films, recordings, and the radio.

In conjunction with the Belgian schema, a proposed catechism lesson was issued to those attending the *carrefour* in which by means of a series of questions and answers the actual situation of Christian disunity was portrayed in summary form. The final question of the lesson, for example, asked: How should a Catholic hasten the reunion of all Christians? — We must do everything we possibly can to bring about Christian unity: by loving our separated brethren; by giving them the example of a genuine Christian life; by being better acquainted with Eastern Christianity and its difficulties; by praying for this intention — above all during the January Week of Prayer and the novena in preparation for Pentecost.

At earlier sessions of the congress, the question of disunion was brought into prominence by various speakers, both of the clergy and the laity. Touching on the subject in her address dealing with the laity in Europe, Dr. Marga A. Klompe of the Netherlands declared that European Christians had a particular responsibility, in that the peoples of Asia and Africa looked upon them as reflecting the Christian message. « The fact that Christians are divided instead of making up a unity as Christ wished them to do », affirmed Dr. Klompe, « must occasion in us a constant concern and inquietude. It is therefore a serious responsibility to undertake and maintain ecumenical discussion between Christians in Europe, where the present division had its origin ».

★ ★ ★

Week of Prayer Promoted by World Council

The Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches has again issued its appeal for prayers for unity during the period from January 18 to January 25. In accordance with a practice begun in 1941, the Commission has made available some 57,000 copies of its prayer leaflet for the 1959 Week of Prayer, printed in English, French, and German. While retaining the customary daily prayer for unity during this period — « O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to thy apostles, ... » — the prayer appeal this time is based on the different petitions of the Our Father, together with prayers from both Eastern and Western liturgies.

« The very act of Christian prayer is an act of unity », declares the introductory part of the leaflet. « For it presupposes that Christians pray, according to the guidance of their Lord, ' Our Father '. In spite of all the divisions and separations between Christians, their common ' Our Father ' rises to affirm the deeper truth of their existance — ' One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all '.

« It is not only the words ' Our Father ' which are so rich in suggesting the kind of unity which our Lord's Prayer involves. Each petition leads us into God's presence and at the same time each leads us into unity by revealing the source of Christian unity, the means for nurturing that unity, the ways of expressing it, and the ultimate hope with which Christian unity is crowned.

« Each year during the period January 18-25, Christians of many churches and confessions and in all parts of the world join together in praying for unity. The order for this Week of Prayer in 1958 is based on the Lord's Prayer, and is intended for either corporate or private devotion ».

★ ★ ★

Dr. Asmussen Discusses Catholic-Protestant Relations at Speyer

At the invitation of the Catholic Instruction Society (Katholische Bildungswerk), Dr. Hans Asmussen was present recently at Speyer as guest speaker at a conference dealing with relations between Catholics and Protestants in Germany. Dr. Asmussen is the well-known Lutheran theologian who is living in retirement at Hei-

delberg. In late years he has been one of the most prominent exponents of a *rapprochement* between the Catholic and Lutheran communions in his country.

In his Speyer conference, Dr. Asmussen did not pretend to give a systematic exposition of all the problems involved in bettering rapports between the two confessions in Germany. Neither did he wish to gloss over the theological differences which divide them. Instead he laid emphasis on the common Christian substance common to both, which should serve as a basis of a complete understanding. He stated further that there were many on both sides who did not consider the actual separation as something fateful or due to chance, but as a fault. There is, he said, a long way between one communion and the other; and that is precisely why a great measure of charity is needed in seeking out one's separated brethren.

Dr. Asmussen declared that the instruction of the Holy Office in 1949 regarding the ecumenical movement had attained its aim. After the *monitum* was issued, co-operation in the *Una Sancta* movement improved despite a change in its mode of action. First of all, Catholics and Protestants have been working separately. In this way, the *Una Sancta* has avoided the charge of proselytism. However, the two boards of twelve theologians from each confession meet together for discussion either at Paderborn (the Catholic center) or at Bethel (the Protestant center).

The speaker went on to recommend especially the spirit of fraternity. He said that when the Pope speaks of separated brethren, he undoubtedly wishes to recall a spiritual fact: If one is born of Christ, he loves his brother.

With reference to prayer for unity of faith, Dr. Asmussen felt that on this point there was more zeal on the Catholic side. But, he continued, « just as there are among us (Protestants) men and women who pray each day for tho Pope and the bishops, there should also be among Catholics those who pray every day for the responsible leaders of the Lutheran Church ».

★ ★ ★

A Plan for Church Unity Based on Faith, Hope, and Charity

Disunity among Christians is « spiritual dishonesty », and it can be corrected according to a plan based on the three theological virtues. This was the stand taken by Fr. Gordon Albion when he addressed a group of Catholics, Anglicans, and Protestants at Southhampton in late November. The priest-historian and author said

that Christians should work to overcome disunity by deciding what action they are prepared to undertake under each of the headings of faith, hope, and charity.

Hope should be first, he declared. « It must be our sincere hope that Christ's prayer, ' ... that all may be one, even as thou, Father, in me and I in thee ... ' (John 17, 21) be fulfilled. We must add our prayers to His, praying for each other that each of us may see ... light and be guided by it ».

Of faith and understanding from faith, Father Albion said: « We must each try to re-examine his beliefs, what our own religious leaders tell us of the great doctrines of Christianity. We must try to find out and understand each other's beliefs and different points of view on the doctrines which divide us ».

Father Albion added that all Christians must be prepared to meet one another and discuss points of difference in a spirit of charity. (*NC*).

★ ★ ★

Archbishop of Canterbury Warns of Danger of United Churches

Addressing an audience of 3000 people at the Britsh Council of Churches' bi-annual meeting at Leeds recently, Dr Geoffrey Fisher, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, saw danger in the prospect of a united Church. « You can also realise what a terrible danger we ourselves could be in », stated Dr. Fisher. « I mean this sincerely because, if we were all one and united, the danger of the freedom to differ from the majority in power would be threatened, and there has always been in the history of the world a great value in minorities and differences of opinion ».

« Please God », continued the Anglican Primate, « some day there will be a united Church — in some sense united. But it will not come until we are all strong enough in the Christian faith to bear with one another's differences and to refuse to exterminate them by force. And that is a big threat, because we live in a world in which the instinctive action is to exterminate your opponent by fair means and sometimes by foul. We are not yet fit enough in the sight of God to be a completely united Church ». (*Ch. Times*).

★ ★ ★

American Methodists to Establish Ecumenical Commission

In consequence of Methodist participation in the Faith and Order Conference at Oberlin, Ohio, last September, a new Com-

mission on Ecumenical Consultation is now being set up by the Methodist Church for the purpose of fruitful discussion with other denominations in matters of Faith and Order. This step was approved by the Council of Bishops at its regular meeting in Gatlinburg, Tennessee, in November.

The idea for the new commission is derived principally from a paper read at Oberlin by Bishop F. Gerald Ensley of the Methodist Church. Membership in it will be fairly representative; it will consist of eight bishops, twelve theology professors, eight pastors, six laymen, and two delegates from the Methodist Boards of Mission and Education (*EPS*).

★ ★ ★

Further Progress towards Lutheran Unification in America

The three major Lutheran bodies in the United States have moved a step closer to eventual amalgamation. Recently, a committee made up of representatives of the American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church voted to accept a progressive plan leading to a unified administration by January 1961. The resultant body, with a combined membership of some 2,000,000, will then be known as the American Lutheran Church.

According to the Ecumenical Press Service, the necessary documents for the merger will be completed by February 1, 1958. There will then be an interval of two years given over to consultation and planning, leading up to the final conventions of the three groups in Minneapolis from April 20-23, 1960. Immediately after wards, the new body's constitution convention will hold its sessions from April 24 to 27. The congregations themselves will mark the unification by special services on Pentecost Sunday, 1960.

★ ★ ★

American Episcopal Group Advises Further Study of the Question of South India

Following directives given at the Anglican Congress in Minneapolis in 1954, the Joint Committee on Ecumenical Relations of the American Episcopal Church this summer issued a « Report on South India ». The Congress had urged ' that an early evaluation by made by an officially appointed body in each member Church of the Anglican Communion of the situation as it is developing in the

Church of South India '. It its Report the Joint Commission of the Episcopal Church, although stating that full intercommunion was not yet advisable, still recommended that in its General Convention for 1958 the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. should decide on « the fullest possible fellowship » and « partial communion » with the C. S. I.

In October, meanwhile, the Council of the American Church Union, a society within the American Episcopal Church, published a statement advising further study of the question and a postponement of any relative action. The text of this declaration reads as follows:

« Taking the request of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations to study the report regarding the Church of South India most seriously, we have made a careful Church-wide survey representative of our members, and after much effort we wish to present our findings to that Commission.

« First, we wish to thank the Commission for the generous time allowed for such study. This has been most helpful, in contradistinction to the two-day pre-publication of the matter in England. We also wish to thank the Commission for the literature made available on this subject.

« We find that:

« 1. The Church of South India itself states that it does not desire to be judged until the end of a thirty-year waiting period.

« 2. The Church of South India itself has indicated that it may review its actions at the end of thirty years, reserving the right to restate its position at that time.

« 3. As yet we do not have enough factual information regarding the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South India to say whether or not there is a basis for intercommunion.

« 4. The doctrinal and liturgical formularies of the Church of South India are not sufficiently clear to afford a comparison with our own or to make an evaluation of them possible.

« 5. Finally, we respectfully submit that the terms ' partial communion ' or ' limited communion ' are contradictory. There are no such definable relations.

« Therefore, the Church should take no action relative to the Church of South India at this time. In all charity, it is our sincere hope that we may all grow fully in the faith.

« We call for a continued widespread study of the really crucial subject, which is the Doctrine of the Nature of the Church ». (*Faith and Unity*)

★ ★ ★

Prospects of Reunion for French Protestants

Organized by the French Ecumenical Study Commission, which originated in 1955 under the chairmanship of Professor Roger Mehl, an ecumenical study assembly was held at Bièvres during the latter part of October to discuss the possibilities of a unification of the Reformed and Lutheran bodies in France. The principal themes for consideration by the delegates were: « The Responsibilities of the Protestant Churches for European Unity », and « What Does the Common Membership of Our Reformed and Lutheran Churches in the World Council Mean? »

Reporting on the assembly in the Protestant newspaper *Réforme,* Professor Jean Bosc of the Reformed Theological Faculty in Paris affirmed that in France there exists a « sufficient doctrinal consensus ... and a sufficient fellowship (particularly with the establishment of intercommunion) for a possibility of reunion of the French Protestant churches to be envisaged ». He pointed out as examples of this the missionary, institutional, and youth activities in which both Lutherans and Reformed are co-operating, and declared that this was a « sign that they can live together in a common faith ». (*EPS*)

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Pope Pius Encourages Co-operation of Catholic Laity with non-Catholics

Addressing some 2000 delegates who came to Rome in October from over eighty different countries to attend the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, Pope Pius recalled to his listeners his concluding words at the first congress of the laity six years ago when he declared: « If there is in this world a force capable of disposing the minds of men to a sincere reconciliation and to a fraternal union of peoples, it is certainly the Catholic Church ».

The Pope then proceeded to show how much the realization of this prospect depended on the role of the laity in the various levels of social life and indicated the directions to be taken by Catholic laymen in bringing it about more effectively.

Among the directives given by the Holy Father to the lay delegates was that of « collaborating with neutral and non-Catholic movements and organizations if ... by so doing, you serve the common good and the cause of God ». The Pope also encouraged them to take an even greater part particularly in international organizations like U.N.E.S.C.O. and in those which called for technically qualified persons so that « by their life and the exercise of their profession they might give the example of a fully developed Christian life ». (*Oss. Romano*)

★ ★ ★

Church Archivists Asked by Pope to Publish More Facts on Church's Past

Keepers of Church archives have been asked by His Holiness, Pope Pius to search their « time-yellowed papers » and to publish material on the Church's forgotten eras.

Addressing members of the Italian Ecclesiastical Archivists, the Pope said that the opening of the Vatican archives to histo-

rians was inspired by the « tranquil conscience of the Church regarding the past ».

The Holy Father recalled the work of several popes who had contributed to the preservation and cataloguing of Church archives, and he referred specifically to Pius V, Sixtus V, Clement VIII, Paul V, and Leo XIII.

Leo XIII's opening of part of the Vatican archives in the last century was praised by Pope Pius as a « courageous act, inspired by the tranquil conscience of the Church regarding the past, by the certainty that history, studied in its true sources with a spirit free of passion and prejudice, would spontaneously produce in itself the most splendid apology of the Church and the Papacy ».

The Pope, in a speech on September 7, 1955, promised to open a further section of the archives for historians, and Vatican officials have said that work is already underway to carry out that promise.

« The facts have since completely justified the magnanimity and trusting confidence of that great Pontiff (Leo XIII) », said Pope Pius. « Research work conducted in the archives and in publications that followed have not diminished, but on the contrary have increased to no small extent the respect and the moral authority of the supreme pontiff, the Holy See, and the Church ».

The Holy Father called on the archivists to publish material contained in the archives that would be of true historical interest and usefulness, especially for pastoral theology and the welfare of souls.

One may rightfully believe, he declared further, that much of the truth, beauty, and piety are still hidden in ancient records concerning that Church which « lives today and will live eternally in the history of the world ». (*Oss. Romano*)

★ ★ ★

Spiritual and Moral Forces Stressed by Pope Pius in Meeting with German President

In greeting President Theodor Heuss of Germany during his official state visit to the Holy See in November, His Holiness Pope Pius declared that liberty can be retained in free Europe and regained in the Communist satellites only if statesmen give a decisive « no » to the powers threatening freedom. The Holy Father also warned that European freedom and culture can only be preserved by relying on the spiritual and moral forces that are essentially inherent in that culture.

The Pope praised Germany for its remarkable recovery from the war years, and as evidence of its good will in preserving its ancient culture, he singled out the nation's reaffirmation of the validity of its Concordat with the Holy See.

« We feel », said His Holiness, « that history and present facts allow Us to state that Catholic doctrine, understood as an idea and action, can bring a contribution of precious values where it is a matter of preserving the spiritual and moral basis of the real and better European culture, a basis without which the fight for freedom against an opponent, such as that ideology which has become a power of a completely different kind, would be lost from the start ». (*NC*)

★ ★ ★

ITALY

State Religion Ruled as Compatible with Freedom for Other Religions

The Italian Constitutional Court has ruled that Catholicism's position as the state religion in Italy does not interfere with the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion.

The decision, which stated that the special position of the Catholic Church in no way interferes with the « free exercise of worship and freedom of other religious confessions », was sought by a local magistrate in Mineo, Sicily.

The latter contended that there is a contradiction between the article of Italy's Constitution which establishes freedom for all religions and equality among them, and the article which recognizes Catholicism as the state religion. He appealed to the high court in the case involving an Italian citizen who was charged with publicly insulting the Church and brought to trial. The magistrate argued that the provision of the penal code, under which the Church is treated differently from other religious bodies, is unconstitutional.

In its ruling, however, the court pointed out that the penal laws granting special protection to the Catholic Church are called for by the Lateran Treaty between Italy and the Holy See and do not interfere with the freedom of other religions. It also noted that in the matter of the Church's privileged status the ancient tradition of the Italian people has to be taken into account. « The fact cannot be denied », declared the court, « that the Catholic Church holds a position different from that of other religious organizations because of the ancient and uninterrupted tradition of the Italian people, almost all of whom belong to it ». (*NC*)

* * *

FRANCE

Church in France Praised by Holy Father

« The promising vitality of the Church in France never ceases to gladden Us, even though We must sometimes control its aspirations and restrain its ardor ».

His Holiness Pope Pius made this statement in a latter to His Eminence Achille Cardinal Lienart, Bishop of Lille, in reply to the message of fidelity he received from the recent meeting of the Assembly of French Cardinals and Archbishops.

The Holy Father also wrote that he has confident hopes for the success of the celebrations marking the centenary of Our Lady's apparitions at Lourdes in 1958. This coming year, the Pope said, « will be a year of prayer and action, of spiritual deepening and apostolic conquest, of doctrinal strengthening, and of generous response to the needs of our times ». (*Doc. Catholique*)

* * *

ENGLAND

Anglican Bishop Proposes Representation of other Confessions in House of Lords

Speaking in the House of Lords, Dr. G. K. A. Bell, retiring Bishop of Chichester and an honorary president of the World Council of Churches, advocated that steps be taken to have other confessions represented in the Upper House of Parliament. Ever since the time of Henry VIII, the Anglican Church alone of English religious bodies has enjoyed representation in that Assembly. Of the present 733 members of the House of Lords, 26 belong to the Anglican clergy, including both the primates of Canterbury and York.

In support of his proposal, Dr. Bell declared that the assembly would profit greatly by the advice of those who stand for the great moral forces of today. Among the communions Bishop Bell wished to see represented were the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of Scotland. (*ANSA*)

* * *

GERMANY

Persecution against Christian Groups Continues in East Germany

The recent sentencing of Dr. Siegfried Schmutzler, student chaplain of Leipzig, to five years of hard labor for alleged boycotting activities, is another in a series of incidents provoked by the East German government against Protestants and Catholics alike. Common resistance by Christian groups against the Communist youth movement has continued to exacerbate the authorities of the German Democratic Republic.

Referring to the case of Dr. Schmutzler, Bishop Hanns Lilje of Hanover declared: « There is a connection between this and all the propaganda against Church leaders. Because the Church provides spiritual care for the members of the armed forces (as is its duty), it is charged with being subservient to NATO, which is grotesque. More and more pressure is being brought to bear upon Christian parents to let their children take part in the « Youth Dedication ». The intention is to enforce brutally the monopoly of the materialist worldview. That spells the end of religious liberty. By condemning this attitude, we align ourselves with all who respect human dignity ».

In recent months several Lutheran pastors in East Germany have been arrested for refusing to give Christian burial to persons who had actively co-operated with the Communist youth movement (*Jugendweihe*). In reference to one such case which occurred in Schwerin, Cardinal Josef Frings of Cologne wrote to Lutheran Bishop Dibelius of Berlin to express his sense of « pain and indignation ». « We feel ». wrote the Cardinal, « as though we had all been arrested too, for everyone with church oversight, whether Protestant or Catholic, would have felt obliged to act in the same way in a similar situation ».

Catholics and Protestants have often joined together in protesting the measures of the East German government against religion, and have been constrained to do so all the more in the face of an intensified compaign unleashed in that area during the past year. (*EPS*)

* * *

GREECE

A Letter of the Orthodox Faculty of Athens Following the Death of Bishop Calavassy

His Excellency, Bishop George Calavassy, Apostolic Exarch of the Byzantine Rite Catholics of Greece, passed away at Zurich on November 7, following a long illness. His funeral, at which members of the Orthodox Church were also present, took place at Athens a short time later. The late Bishop was always deeply interested in the work of reunion and had counted among his close friends Fr. Paul Wattson, S. A., the founder of the January Octave of Prayer.

The death of Mgr. Calavassy gave occasion to the Orthodox Theological Faculty of Athens to address an appeal to Pope Pius to take steps to end the division between East and West. One of the measures the Faculty urged was that the Pope refrain from appointing a successor to Bishop Calavassy, on the grounds that the 'Uniate' movement was 'poisoning relations between Orthodox Catholics and Roman Catholics'.

The appeal of the Orthodox Faculty, which was signed by Dean Geras Konidaris and other professors, came as a surprise to many, particularly the argument that the existence of Byzantine Rite groups in union with the Holy See constituted a great obstacle in the way of a reconciliation between the Orthodox Churches and Rome.

Actually, almost all of the many Catholic churches of Eastern Rite had their origin in what for lack of a better term one might call a 'group-conversion'; that is to say, that a number of dissident Christians joined the Catholic Church, not as so many isolated individuals, but as a group with hierarchy, pastors, faithful, and the material organization of dioceses, parishes, churches, etc. They brought with them also, of course, their rite, for there was no reason, when they retained their old organization and customs, why they should have abandoned their rite; since what distinguishes the Catholic Church is unity of faith, not uniformity of rite, or language, or race. Indeed there was every reason why they should have retained their rite, for the principle of parity of rites had long ago been laid down in the Council of Florence, and for a short time — alas, far too short — the Latin and the Greek Churches had lived it with regard to each other.

Unity of faith with parity of rite. If a group of separated brethren turns to Rome with an appeal for union, professing that it now has unity of faith with her, Rome cannot reject the plea; it must bid them welcome with their rite, their traditions, their customs. And as it welcomes them at the time of their coming, so it must continue to foster and nourish their faith and piety and to encourage them to preserve their rite in its integrity and purity, doing at least as much for them as it does for the mass of Latin Catholics, perhaps even a little bit more, as the Catholics of Eastern Rite are, by comparison with the Latins, fewer in numbers. So it has done in the past with, for example, the Ruthenian Church, the first to be united with Rome after the Council of Florence and the largest; so too with the smallest of the Catholic Eastern Churches, at present in mourning for the loss of its shepherd.

Greek Orthodox Establish Agency to Control Foreign Proselytism

The Orthodox Church in Greece has recently created a new department for the purpose of « observing and controlling the activities of foreign proselytism ». The administration of the new office is centered at Athens and is headed by Bishop Damaskinos who is auxiliary to Archbishop Theoclitos of Athens and All Greece. Its aim will be to supply information to the Holy Synod on the number of those belonging to non-Orthodox bodies in Greece and to report on all proselytizing activities.

The Ecumenical Press Service reports the Athens daily newspaper *To Vima* as saying that the purpose in view is « to protect Orthodox people from the foreign propagandists who, unfortunately, have lately multiplied and widened their activities. The department faces the delicate task of controlling the activities of the foreign sects, while at the same time not clashing with the tolerance and freedom accorded to non-Orthodox churches by the constitution of all liberal countries ».

★ ★ ★

HUNGARY

Government-Appointed Officials Replace Leaders of Lutheran Church

Spokesmen for the Lutheran World Federation announced at their Geneva headquarters in December that the Hungarian Government had taken measures to replace duly elected Lutheran leaders in Hungary with government appointees. In consequence of this

step, Bishop Lajos Vetö, has been returned as presiding bishop of the Lutheran Church in Hungary, a post which he had occupied from 1950 until the October Revolution when he resigned. He is thus replacing Bishop Zoltan Tureczy who was elected by the congregations in January 1957.

Other officials who have been reinstated are the former General Secretary of the Lutheran Church, Karl Grunvalszky, who had also previously resigned; and Ernö Mihalyfi, General Inspector, who escaped to Austria during the revolt against the Communist regime. All three of these officers were restored by the government on the grounds that they had left their posts under intimidation.

Up until December 17, the directors of the Lutheran World Federation at Geneva had received no definite word on the situation from Bishop Lajos Ordass who was restored to his position as head of the Lutheran Church in Hungary shortly before the revolt of October 1956. However, Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist, Executive Secretary of the L. W. F. who visited Bishop Ordass in November, has quoted him as foreseeing an imminent crisis in the affairs of his Church.

In the wake of the announcement from Hungary, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, who was elected president of the Lutheran World Federation last summer, sent a cablegram to the Hungarian State Office for Church Affairs which read in part:

« Impossible to overstate the shock and anxiety felt by the world-wide fellowship of the Lutheran World Federation, embracing 50 million Christians in 32 nations, on receiving the news that the Government of Hungary, acting unilaterally, has overridden the will of the congregations of that country by arbitrarily displacing a bishop and other church officials who had been freely chosen, and are trusted by the Church ... The Lutheran World Federation strongly protests the recent action of the Government of Hungary as a violation ... and urgently calls for its reversal ».

★ ★ ★

THE UNITED STATES

New Theological Library Dedicated at Princeton University

The Robert E. Speer Library, said to be the « largest and best designed theological library in the United States », was dedicated at Princeton Theological Seminary on October 8. Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University, delivered the main address at the dedication ceremonies.

The new building, which replaces the old Lenox Library, has a book capacity of 400,000 volumes, and already possesses a collection of 250,000 catalogued titles. Among these is to be found a collection of English Puritan literature, dating from 1550 to 1700.

Besides possessing a large reading room, classrooms, and study stalls, the library also has a section reserved for rare books. An interesting feature of the new building is a special ventilating system which maintains a constant measure of humidity in those sections where the books are stored, thus preserving the pages from excessive dryness and from becoming too brittle. (*N. Y. Times*)

BOOK REVIEWS

A Woman of Unity, by Sister Mary Celine, S. A. Foreword by the Most Rev. Richard Cushing, D. D., Garrison, N. Y., Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement, 1956. Pp. XV + 357. $ 4.50.

In reading this biography of an esteemed convert to the Catholic faith in the United States one is reminded of the words of Christopher Dawson: « The cause of Christian unity », he wrote in *Judgment of Nations,* « can best be served neither by religious controversy nor by political action but by the theological virtues: faith, hope and charity ... The first and greatest step towards religious unity is an internal and spiritual one ... ». These words sum up the character and career of Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S. A., who was so deeply imbued with the desire of a reunited Christendom and whose entire life was the living out of this principle.

With Father Paul James Francis, S. A., Mother Lurana was co-founder of the Society of the Atonement at Gfraymoor, N. Y., about fifty miles north of New York City on the eastern side of the Hudson River. Like him she prayed and suffered for years until she entered the Church in 1909 at the age of forty; like him she sought to inspire others with the longing for religious unity and dedicated the religious family she began with this holy resolve. Like him she had a special attraction for St. Francis of Assisi whose Lady Poverty she loved and imitated with genuine devotion.

The first intimation of a religious vocation came to her rather early in life when she was in school. « I became conscious to two things: first, that my life was to be different ... and secondly, that I wished to do and suffer something worthwhile for God and for others ». (p. 11). The rest of her life was a clarification and development of these two ideals.

This noble foundress was one of those brave, valiant, and intrepid women to whom God entrusts a special vocation and communicates extraordinary graces of sympathy and leadership. Her work and influence were often behind the scenes, but nonetheless real and effective. Mother Lurana had a part to play in all the

spiritual projects in which Father Paul engaged: in publishing *The Lamp* which began in February, 1903, as a monthly dedicated to Christian Unity and the Missions; in the Rosary League of Our Lady of the Atonement, a pious society of prayer and good works, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin for the the cause of Unity; in the Union-That-Nothing-Be-Lost which collected several million dollars to spread the faith and help missionaries in all parts of the world. Of her part in the Chair of Unity Octave we shall mention in a later connection.

She was truly *A Woman of Unity* in her own pursuit of truth which led her to embrace the Church with Father Paul and their companions on October 30, 1909 in the little convent chapel at Graymoor. She merits the title as well for doing much to bring others to the One Fold. She wrote the first chapter of the book *The Prince of the Apostles* (1907) published jointly by Father Paul and Rev. Spencer Jones (who remained in the Anglican communion). She had the Sisters beg for money in New York City to pay the bills for printing *The Lamp* in the early days. She wrote and suggested articles, did book reviews and proof-reading, and cared for much of the correspondence for both communites of Friars and Sisters.

Mother Lurana was closely associated with Father Paul since 1897 when she first wrote to him about her desire to imitate St. Francis. She came first to Graymoor in the winter of 1898 before the Friars' founder, from the comfort and security of her home in Warwick, N. Y. She spent the first part of the winter in the rented half of a farmhouse some distance from the little church which was allotted for the use of the Sisters. Although her New York home was not far (about fifty miles south) from where Fr. Paul (as Rev. Lewis Wattson) had served as pastor in Kingston, N. Y., she did not get in touch with him until he had gone to Omaha, Nebraska, to assume charge of a group of unmarried clergymen devoted to parochial work.

But she became more than just a close associate. She was indeed the co-founder of the Society of the the Atonement. She realized in her own life the ideals of Father Paul, better than any of his own friars, somewhat like St. Clare understood so well the mission and message of the gentle Francis of Assisi. Mother Lurana's work for Unity was through the apostolate of prayer, sacrifice, suffering, and retirement — for the love of God and the love of souls.

In his brief but striking foreward, Archbishop Cushing of Boston pays tribute to Mother Lurana and her vocation of Christian Unity. « Lurana Mary White became a religious by divine vocation

long before her religious profession was ratified by the Church », he writes. « Eleven years were to pass between the day she took her vows privately before Father Paul Francis and the day of formal profession following her conversion ... During the quarter century of ceaseless activity Mother Lurana fulfilled the mission which God had entrusted to her. When she died in 1935, five years before the death of Father Paul Francis, she could stand before the heavenly Bridegroom, her lamps lighted in the oil of a magnificent apostolate. (xii). No one can view the portrayal of Mother Lurana ... without sensing the desire with which this saintly servant of God was inflamed: that they all may be one » (xiii). The Archbishop echoes the sentiments of all the Graymoor Sisters in his closing sentence: « I pray that many new vocations to the Society of the Atonement may be the fruit of this book, and that its wide circulation may bring heavenly joy to those who are already disciples of her who is rightly eulogized as ' A Woman of Unity ' ».

Mother Lurana had a keen appreciation of the vocation of Unity for herself and for her Sisters. « The union of Christendom is our unique aim », she would remind them. « We like to separate our name and think of its syllables, At-one-ment, meaning to make at-one. This is very evidently our special vocation, the one for which God called our Society into being. And this is what Rome expects from the Society of the Atonement. We know how our late Holy Father, Pius X, had hoped that this Society would do much for Unity » (p. 317). On another occasion she said to her Sisters: « ... how great a vocation is ours, nothing less than to help to answer Our Lord's prayer at the Last Supper, ' that all may be One '. When we love anyone very much we pay great attention to the dying request which he makes, and we may look upon this as Our Lord's dying request. How great a privilege is ours! ».

She recalled the work of the Franciscan friars in the apostolate of Unity and seemed to suggest that this was another reason for the prayers and sacrifices of her Sisters. « We have the Franciscan tradition in this great work. We too should be vitally interested in the reunion of the Eastern dissidents. Saint Francis is interested still and expects his youngest child, our Institute, to do all in its power to give impetus to the reunion of Christendom » (p. 318). Mother Lurana had, of course, a special concern for the Anglicans and their return. « It is well worth the attention of our Religious to win back ' our Lady's Dowry ' as England has been lovingly called », she commented.

Her coming to the Church was a long and gradual search for the truth. The way was not easy but filled with obstacles. The

conviction within her grew, as it did with Father Paul, that no unity was possible apart from the See of Peter. As an Anglican sister she wrote that « the lack of real desire for a return of the Anglican church to reunion with the Holy See has heretofore been on our part, and not on the part of the occupants of the Chair of Peter ». Elsewhere she noted that « It is a futile dream to contemplate a united Church on earth without a visible head ». Then she asked: « Did the Divine Founder of the Catholic Church in its original constitution provide for a permanent head and universal shepherd over His flock, to feed the sheep with sound doctrine and protect them from the wolves of heresy? And is this head the Bishop of Rome? ». In time, her reply was an unqualified affirmation to these questions.

When received into the Church she wrote in her *Memoirs*: « Thank God we are safe in Saint Peter's Boat! The only fervor I felt was when I made my profession of faith, especially at the words: 'And I believe all that the Holy Catholic and Roman Church believes'. It was good to say it aloud and from the inside ». Others were praying for her and her community and for Father Paul. Shortly before returning from Europe in the spring of 1898 with her sister, she visited the holy places in Assisi and met Fr. Bernardine, O. F. M. at the Portiuncula. She was wearing the brown habit and explained her identity to him. She asked for prayers, and he gladly consented. « Would you promise to pray so willingly if you knew that I am what you probably consider a heretic? ». The friar smiled his reply: « We shall pray all the more willingly » (p. 39).

Her work for the Unity Octave was more than just a task well filled. She and her Sisters worked on it from its beginning in 1908, carried on an immense secreterial work in all parts of the world for its promotion, and dedicated their strength and talent to make it known more universally. It was she who conceived the name which the Friars of the Atonement now use in their observance of this program of prayer: The Chair of Unity Octave. In 1926, Cardinal Bourne of Westminster had asked Father Paul if another name might be used as an alternative for 'Church Unity Octave', which was liable to misunderstanding in Britain. On the feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury, the apostle of England, Mother Lurana suggested the official name that is now used, adopted since 1949 by the Friars and Sisters of the Atonement.

Mother Lurana cherished special devotion for the Blessed Virgin under the title that originated at Graymoor: Our Lady of the Atonement. She helped Father Paul compose an Office and Mass for the

feast day, July 9, which was later approved in 1946 by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, for the Atonement Friars and Sisters. She cultivated a deep love for Mary in her own life and communicated it to her own religious; for Mary was the special patroness in the work of Unity as Our Lady of the At-one-ment or Unity.

Mention should be made of her special affection for the poverty of the Poverello. It was no passing attraction but a strong conviction exemplified during her thirty-seven years at Graymoor. « How many snares are avoided by just obedience to the Holy Poverty demanded by St. Francis of his children ... » she said. « Instead of fanaticism, sweet Lady Poverty is the Mother of wisdom and prudence in earthly as well as in heavenly affairs » (p. 209). As Father Paul had spent his first winter in an old paint shack named « Palace of Lady Poverty », so Mother Lurana lived her first winter in a house that was scarcely better, called « old St. Francis House » until a permanent convent was ready.

This is an engaging story of a remarkable woman in the annals of American Franciscana and in the history of the Church in the United States. Sister Mary Celine has caught clearly the spirit of her foundress and related her story with charm and interest. Mother Lurana is an example to all interested in the work of Christian Unity. She demonstrates conclusively the need for personal holiness. There is no substitute for it and without it reunion will never be achieved. For while studies of theology, history, language, ethnology are needed and helpful, they are secondary to the primary need of effecting the reunion of Christendom — personal holiness. May this biography inspire others to a deeper interest and greater sacrifice for the cause of Christian Unity.

TITUS CRANNY, S. A.

Contemporary Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Communications. Correspondence in English and Greek of Bishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis and J. Francis Cardinal McIntyre (published by the Fourth Diocese Greek Orthodox Ministerial Association « Saint Photius ») San Francisco, 1957.

On 16 June 1954 the Greek Bishop Athenagoras of Los Angeles wrote to His Eminence Cardinal McIntyre to draw his attention to an article in the Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical weekly *Apostolos Andreas* commemorating the ninth centenary of the schism of 1054 and deploring its sad consequences. The letter re-

echoed the sentiments of the article, lamenting the lack of a common Christian front to the forces of evil and Communism, urging in harmony with the precept of Christ a greater bond of love between the Churches and suggesting that the Catholic Church should take the initiative in calling all Christians together to study how best to unite their strength in common action against evil. The intention, doubtless, of the letter was excellent. Its expression, however, was not always happy, as for instance, when it is said that the Catholic Church should at long last strive for union of Christians, not by methods of proselytism, but on a basis of love; and that the Catholic Churches of Oriental Rite — the so-called Uniate Churches — unstable in their religious conviction had either returned to their parent bodies, or having become decadent had been absorbed by Communism, or, if still loyal to Rome, were loyal from material interests only.

The Cardinal in his reply stressed, with the aid of a few specific instances, the sincere interest that the Catholic Church has over the centuries always shown in the well-being of Oriental Christians, and now shows more than ever. The two Churches, he wrote, of East and West have a great affinity in doctrine and sacraments, and a basis of unity in the first seven Councils; popes have made overtures to the East; would that its bishops would recur to him again as the first Bishop.

The answer from Bishop Athenagoras was a long tractate ranging over a wide field of Church history. The schism, due to Rome's arbitrariness, mainly thrived upon the egotistical attitude of some responsible leaders of the Western Church. St. Peter was a Bishop in Rome; St. Paul, the ruling Bishop of Rome, consecrated St. Linus as the first Bishop of Rome. Neither St. Gregory the Great nor St. Cyprian acknowledged any primacy of Rome. Innocent III (whom the Cardinal had mentioned in his letter) and the popes of the period of the Second Council of Lyons exemplified the Roman attitude of domination. Patriarchs of Constantinople in more recent times refused papal invitations (also mentioned by the Cardinal) because these implied sovereignty. The 'Uniate' movement founded by the Vatican militates against brotherhood; the 'Uniate' movement of the other side, the 'Latin Rite Orthodox', is a spontaneous movement found in France and the U. S. A. Papal infallibility is unacceptable, as also are all dogmatic decisions made after the seventh Council, including even those defined latterly about the Blessed Virgin, in spite of oriental piety towards her. However, notwithstanding the doctrinal differences between the two Churches and between them and the Protestants, co-operation

among them all in more practical fields is both possible and highly desirable, for all are Christians (1).

The Cardinal acknowledged receipt of this answer, and with that the interchange of letters ended.

This correspondence has since been published in English and Greek by the Council of Greek Orthodox Clergy of the Fourth Diocese « Saint Photius ». On both sides it was conducted with the courtesy and restraint that His Grace Bishop Athenagoras so highly commended. On the other hand, it demonstrated the depth of the cleavage between Eastern and Western Christians, though on only one chief point: the question of the primacy of Rome. We Catholics see in the New Testament the promise by Christ Our Lord to St. Peter of the headship of the Church and the fulfilment of that promise by Him and the exercise of that headship by St. Peter, just as we trace in subsequent Church history the steady evolution of the See of Rome as head of the whole Church on the grounds of the primacy given to the Prince of the Apostles. Our separated Oriental brethren draw diametrically opposite conclusions from the same data. Each Church is convinced that it is right and the other wrong. But this does not mean that we cannot regard each other with love. We can and we should, yet still retaining our intellectual integrity. For mutual love cannot demand that we Catholics should on a sudden jettison the whole of our interpretation of Church history and all the development of Church life from, at least, the eighth century onwards for the sake of harmony among Christians, just as it cannot mean that our separated brethren should overnight change their whole historical outlook and embrace our Catholic attitude without further thought. Mutual love, however, does demand that we should speak and write of each other without harshness; that we should be ready to interpret present actions with charity and to investigate the ancient history of the Church sympathetically, that is, with honesty, with historical accuracy, seeing its events in the setting of their day and not against a false modern background, recognizing mistakes that were made (and mistakes were made on both sides) but ready to excuse them as far as possible because of the ignorances, the misunderstandings, and the weaknesses that were inevitable in the human actors. Love, too, asks for less bitterness about the Catholic Churches of Oriental Rite — the ' Uniate ' Churches — and

(1) The writer's method of quoting Latin theologians is singulary unfortunate. E. g. by omitting, without any indication, part of a sentence of St. Robert Bellarmine, he in fact alters a conditional statement of the saint *de dubiis* into a flat assertion *de certis* — and incidentally adds a wrong reference.

at least an attempt to believe that those unions could have been motivated by conscientious good will and religious conviction. The derogatory words about their present state in the first letter of this published series are more than ungracious. The great Ruthenian Church, for instance, most certainly got little out of union except opposition from the local Catholics in the first years of its existence after 1595. The fidelity and heroism of its many martyrs in these last few years of persecution testify to its continuing bright faith. Affairs behind the Iron Curtain are not conducted as they are in the United States.

The plea enunciated in the first letter of this correspondence for a greater spirit of mutual love between the Churches is one that we all approve. Exchange of opinion, animated by that spirit, between scholars of both Churches can lead to nothing but good, and, if joined with earnest prayer, will assuredly draw down the blessing of God and in the fulness of time lead to the attainment of the ideal proclaimed by the Council of Florence — unity of faith with parity of rite.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

INDEX FOR 1957

ARTICLES

BOUYER, LOUIS,
The Present State of the Protestant Churches . . . . I, 7
BOYER, CHARLES, S. J.,
Meditation for the Feast of St. Peter . . . . . II, 77
From Calvinism to the Catholic Church - an Evolution of Thought . . . . . III, 154
Truth and Charity - the Octave for 1958 . . . . . IV, 233
CORNELIS, JEROME, A. A.,
Cardinal Tisserant's Jubilee - a Tribute . . . . . III, 149
DE VRIES, WILLIAM, S. J.,
The Arab Movement, Christianity and Islam Today . . I, 27
DOUGHERTY, KENNETH, S. A.,
American Protestantism and the Mother of God . . . II, 87
DOUGLAS, JAMES, Ph. D.,
The Reunion Movement in Scotland (Part I) . . . . I, 13
The Reunion Movement in Scotland (Part II) . . . . II, 99
GILL, JOSEPH, S. J.,
Personalities of the Council of Florence: I. Pope Eugenius IV . . . . . IV, 236
KRITZECK, JAMES, Ph. D.,
The Conference at Tioumliline . . . . . IV, 252
LINOWSKI, PACIFIC, O.F.M.,
Vladimir Soloviev's Concept of Unity . . . . . II, 80
MATZERATH, ROGER, S. A.,
An Ecumenical Event in America . . . . . III, 181
QUENARD, GERVAIS, A. A.,
Simple Reflections on « Thou Art Peter » . . . . . I, 3
SHERWOOD, POLYCARP, O. S. B.
The Sense of Rite . . . . . III, 168
STANDERWICK, DE SALES, S. A.
Reform Judaism in the United States . . . . . IV, 245
THOMAS, RALPH, S. A.,
The Jews in the United States . . . . . III, 162

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Archbishop Montini's Pastoral Letter . . . . . I, 44
Our Separated Brethren (C. Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . I, 46
Praying for Unity (B. Leeming, S. J.) . . . . . I, 48
The Catholic Convert and Christian Unity (M. Richards) . I, 51

Archbishop Godfrey's Pastoral Letter to the Catholics of England . . . . . II, 110
An Orthodox Vindication of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary . . . . . II, 114
Anglican 'Notes on an Evanston Report' (B. Leeming, S. J.) II, 118
A German Lutheran Statement on Catholic Truths (Editor's note): . . . . . III, 186
The Age of the Church (VII) . . . . . III, 187
Evangelical Statements on Catholic Truths:
1. The Whole Word of God . . . . . III, 189
2. The Incarnation of the Word and the Mysteries of the Christian Faith . . . . . III, 189
3. Grace and Liberty . . . . . III, 190
4. The Mystery of the Church . . . . . III, 191
5. The Relation of the Head to the Body . . . . . III, 191
6. The Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifice of the Church . . . . . III, 192
7. The Church and the Apostolic Succession of its Ministry . . . . . III, 192
8. Sacerdotal Office and Consecration . . . . . III, 193
9. One Only Governing Voice of the Church . . . III, 194
10. Church, Scripture and Tradition . . . . . III, 194
11. The Teaching Office . . . . . III, 196
12. The Communion of Saints . . . . . III, 196
The W. C. C. and Religious Liberty in Catholic Countries (Note of the Editor and Ambassador Sardi's letter) . III, 196
Message of the Faith and Order Conference at Oberlin . . III, 200
Anglicans and Presbyterians . . . . . III, 202
Letter of Pope Pius XII Commemorating Fiftieth Anniversary of Unity Octave . . . . . IV, 259
The Church of England and the Question of Divorce (Fr. Francis Clark, S. J.) . . . . . IV, 261
Protestantism in Pennsylvania (Fr. Joseph Kerns, S. J.) . IV, 267
Judaism Seeking Itself (Edward Vogt) . . . . . IV, 274

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

London Meeting on Christian Unity . . . . . I, 53
Anglican Editorial Urges Prayer for Unity . . . . . I, 54
Noted French Jesuit Discusses Scripture and Tradition . I, 55
French Protestant Leader Writes on Prayer for Unity . . I, 56
Friars Sponsor Unity Conference at Graymoor . . . I, 56
Christian Unity Institute Inaugurated at Pittsburgh . . I, 57
Noted American Bishop Distinguishes between Prayer and Polemics in Matter of Reunion . . . . . I, 57
English Bishop Urges Co-operation between Christian Bodies I, 58
Executive Committee of World Council Meets at Geneva . I, 58
Next Lambeth Conference to Discuss Unity Questions . . I, 59
A Report on the Unitive Efforts between the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches . . . . . II, 122
World Council Message for Pentecost . . . . . II, 124
Pentecost Novena for Unity at St. Peter's in Rome . . II, 126

European Cathedrals Unite in Unity Broadcast . . . II, 126
Organ of Ecumenical Patriarchate Lauds Pope Pius . . II, 127
English Archbishop Makes Plea for Good Will . . . II, 128
Catholics Counselled to Co-operate with Those of Other Faiths . . . . . II, 128
Catholic Association to Sponsor Eastern Rite Congress at Palermo . . . . . II, 129
Noted Jesuit Lectures on the Church and Reunion . . . II, 129
Greek Orthodox Synod Limits Representation in World Council of Churches . . . . . II, 130
North American Faith and Order Conference Set for September . . . . . II, 131
American Presbyterians Approve Merger . . . . . II, 131
Noted Ecumenical Leader to Retire as Bishop . . . . . II, 132
Major Faith and Order Meeting Held in Ohio . . . . III, 208
Central Committee of the World Council Meets at New Haven III, 211
Benedictines Sponsor Unionistic Congress at Lisle . . III, 213
New Chairman of Faith and Order Commission . . . III, 215
Lutheran World Federation to Undertake Study of Catholic Theology . . . . . III, 216
International Congress on Four Gospels Held at Oxford . III, 217
Student Movement Group Meets at Swanwick . . . . III, 218
Faith and Order Discussion Group Convenes in England . III, 218
Eastern Rite Congress at Palermo . . . . . III, 219
Catholic Theologian Sees Better Relations between Catholics and Protestants . . . . . III, 220
Christian Unity Discussed at World Congress for the Laity IV, 280
Week of Prayer Promoted by World Council . . . . IV, 282
Dr. Asmussen Discusses Catholic-Protestant Relations at Speyer . . . . . IV, 282
A Plan for Church Unity Based on Faith, Hope, and Charity IV, 283
Archbishop of Canterbury Warns of Danger of United Churches . . . . . IV, 284
American Methodists to Establish Ecumenical Commission IV, 284
Further Progress towards Lutheran Unification in America IV, 285
American Episcopal Group Advises Further Study of the Question of South India . . . . . IV, 285
Prospects of Reunion for French Protestants . . . . IV, 287

AROUND THE WORLD

AFRICA

Catholics on Continent Increase by over One Million . . II, 142
New Internuncio to Ethiopia Received by Emperor . . II, 143
First Pontifical University for Africa . . . . . II, 143

AUSTRIA

Manuscript of Haydn Mass Discovered in Benedictine Monastery . . . . . II, 141
Ukrainian Catholics Make Unity Pilgrimage to Marian Shrine of Mariazell . . . . . III, 227

BELGIAN CONGO
Decided Increase in Number of Catholics . . . . I, 69

BELGIUM
Work on Vatican Pavilion for World's Fair Progresses . II, 137
Leading Figure in the Church Unity Apostolate Marks 60th Year as Priest . . . . . II, 137
Russian Church Dedicated at Chevetogne . . . . . III, 227

CHINA
Restrictive Measures against the Church still in Force . . I, 68

COLOMBIA
Catholic Bishops Deny Persecution of Protestants . . . III, 225

EGYPT
Christian Groups Protest against Discrimination . . . III, 228

ENGLAND
British Council of Churches Contrary to Moscow Youth Festival . . . . . I, 63
Pontifical Mass Climaxes 1,300 Anniversary of Whitby Abbey II, 139
Anglican Bishop Proposes Representation of other Confessions in House of Lords . . . . . IV, 291

FRANCE
Cardinal Urges Greater Interest in the Scriptures by Catholics . . . . . I, 62
International Congress of Sacred Music Meets in Paris . . II, 135
Church in France Praised by Holy Father . . . . IV, 291

GERMANY
New Bishop of Berlin Acknowledges Co-operation of Evangelicals . . . . . I, 64
Berlin Protestants Supported in Vatican Radio Broadcast . I, 64
Freiburg Observes Important Centennials . . . . . II, 141
Persecution against Christian Groups Continues in East Germany . . . . . IV, 292

GREECE
A Letter of the Orthodox Faculty of Athens Following the Death of Archbishop Calavassy . . . . . IV, 293
Greek Orthodox Establish Agency to Control Foreign Proselytism . . . . . IV, 294

HUNGARY
Government-Appointed Officials Replace Leaders of Lutheran Church . . . . . IV, 294

IRAQ
Detroit Pastor Named Bishop of Iraq Diocese . . . . I, 67

ITALY
State Religion Ruled as Compatible with Freedom for Other Religions . . . . . IV, 290

JAPAN
Recent Catholic Statistics . . . . . III, 228
PAKISTAN
Nation Counts 270,000 Catholics . . . . . I, 76
POLAND
Cardinal Wyszynski Proclaims National Mission . . . II, 140
ROME
Holy Father Speaks of Rome as the Center of the Church . I, 61
Pope Pius Stresses Importance of Vatican Libraries and Archives . . . . . II, 133
Pope Extols Education towards World Peace . . . . II, 133
American Jewish Group at Special Papal Audience . . . II, 134
Brigittine Abbess General Dies in Rome . . . . . II, 135
Pope Pius Addresses World Gathering of Young Christian Workers . . . . . III, 222
Work Completed on Microfilming of Vatican Documents . III, 223
Additional Canons of Code for Eastern Church Promulgated III, 223
Pope Pius Encourages Co-operation of Catholic Laity with Non-Catholics . . . . . IV, 288
Church Archivists Asked by Pope to Publish More Facts on Church's Past . . . . . IV, 288
Spiritual and Moral Forces Stressed by Pope Pius in Meeting with German President . . . . . IV, 289
SPAIN
Message of Pope Pius to Social Week Observance . . . II, 140
SUDAN
Parliament Ratifies Government Seizure of Mission Schools . III, 229
SWITZERLAND
Catholic Primate Discusses Religious Tolerance . . . . I, 62
THE SOVIET UNION
Orthodox Church Calls on Exiles to Return . . . . . I, 65
THE UNITED STATES
Visiting Benedictine Advocates Cultural Relations with Islam . . . . . I, 66
Completion of Index to Summa Theologica . . . . . I, 67
Recent Catholic Statistics . . . . . II, 142
Late Religious Statistics . . . . . III, 224
Lutherans Urged to Combat Communism . . . . . III, 225
New Theological Library Dedicated at Princeton University IV, 295

BOOK REVIEWS

CLARK, FRANCIS, S. J.,
Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention (J. Gill, S. J.) . I, 72
Contemporary Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Communications (J. Gill, S. J.) . . . . . IV, 301

HARDON, JOHN A., S. J.,
The Protestant Churches of America (P. Damboriena, S. J.) I, 144
MARY CELINE, SISTER, S. A.,
A Woman of Unity (Titus Cranny, S. A.) . . . . . IV, 297
ROUSSEAU, DOM OLIVIER, O. S. B.,
Monachisme et vie religieuse d'après l'ancienne tradition de l'Eglise (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . III, 230
SARTORY, THOMAS, O. S. B.,
Die katholische Kirche un die getrennten Christen (J. Cornélis, A. A.) . . . . . I, 75
WILLIAMSON, HUGH ROSS,
The Walled Garden (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . II, 70
WOODARD, DAVAD,
Our Separated Brethren (Kevin Mc Morrow, S. A.) . . . III, 231